

The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, AUGUST 24, 1876.

The Week.

THE canvass has not displayed any very remarkable new features during the week. It consists on the Republican side almost wholly of attacks on Tilden's personal and professional character, which until now (he is sixty six years old) has always been considered very good; and even so late as 1871 he was cordially treated by the *New York Times*, and recommended for election to the Legislature as a man of high character. But it is astonishing to see how much wickedness he was all the time keeping concealed. Winslow appears to have been nothing to him in the matter of hypocrisy, for during forty years he has been a leading lawyer, and the administrator of large trusts, and a favorite counsellor of embarrassed individuals and corporations, without being exposed. The chief charge against him is, however, his appropriation of certain stock and bonds of the Terre Haute Railroad, which we discuss elsewhere. We perceive in one paper a charge that he also "flooded Northern Michigan with \$4,000,000 of bogus money," from which it would appear that he has been one of the most prominent counterfeiters of ancient or modern times. That he was drunk on the night of his nomination appears to be settled, and we are in daily expectation of hearing that he defrauded an insurance company by arson. He also tried to prevent his prosecution in the "Terre Haute" affair by having the attorney of his pursuers made corporation counsel. Mr. Hewitt made a brilliant defence of him in the House of Representatives on the last night of the session as regards his war record, but in this the *Times* has pricked one or two bad holes. It is curious to see how "charges" grow. The circular issued by the Ring in 1868 to the country Democratic committees to telegraph the majorities to New York early—plainly with a view to fraud—had Tilden's name attached to it. He promptly denied that he signed it or knew of its existence, but we nevertheless now see it referred to as "his celebrated private letter."

The President has during the week furnished the public with food for reflection or for mirth, as the case may be, by an interview with the Washington correspondent of the *Herald*, in which he revealed some state secrets of a very remarkable character. One was that he had detected Mr. Bristow in "a conspiracy" having for its object his own elevation to the Presidency, and he intimated pretty broadly that the whiskey prosecutions were got up in aid of the same hellish design. So he has withdrawn his confidence from Mr. Bristow. One of the saddest things in General Grant's career is that he never will make his conduct square with his friends' theory of his character. Just as they are telling us how "sagacious" he is, he is pretty sure to commit some piece of great folly; and then, just as they begin to call attention to his "simplicity," he will perform some stroke of exceeding shrewdness. Then, again, when they are dwelling on his touching fidelity to his friends he upsets their analysis by suddenly throwing overboard some of his few respectable associates on the strength of chance gossip collected in the streets. He holds on to Babcock, or Casey, or Shepherd, or Schenck "under fire," but he bids Jewell and Bristow run at the first volley. All this, of course, is very trying for his apologists. What they now begin to aver in their extremity is that Washington and nearly all other good men had detractors; Grant has detractors—and, therefore, Grant must be a good man. They apparently forget that this argument will cover the case of Tweed and Belknap, besides being somewhat infantile in its construction.

In the interview with the *Herald* correspondent, the President also gave his ideas of what an "investigation" should be by means of an example of one conducted by himself, which certainly formed

a striking contrast to these carried on by the Democrats in Congress. Charges of complicity or connection with the gold operations of Black Friday against Generals Porter and Belknap came to him from New York, in the shape of a "roll of papers." He let them lie in his drawer, he said, for a few days—we suppose for the purpose of having them settle—and then handed them over to his son, the youthful Mr. Ulysses S. Grant, jr., with instructions to look into them. Mr. Grant did look into them, and reported there was nothing in them whatever, and this ended the matter. Now, here was no prying into private telegrams, or examination of private check-books or accounts, or correspondence, such as the wicked Democrats have been indulging in, and no calling in of "Confederate generals" to overhaul the affairs of loyal men. And this the President evidently thinks is the way in which charges against good fellows ought to be looked into. There are sad rumors of a breach between Tom Murphy and the Custom-house men, and Babcock and "the Washington set." Even the former think Babcock has been "leading the President astray."

As we go to press it is difficult to form any definite impression as to the probable termination of the struggle at Saratoga over the Republican nomination. The important event of the past few days has been the split between the "Independent" and the Custom-house Republicans of this city, both organizations sending delegations to the Convention. The split originated in a difference between the call of the State and the local committees, the former inviting everybody to the primaries who intended to vote for Hayes, the latter prudently excluding all who had not been enrolled in some regular Republican club. As this was tantamount to excluding all the better class of Republicans in the city, and in direct disobedience to the call of the State Committee, the Independents determined to call primaries of their own, which they proceeded forthwith to do with complete success, electing a full delegation to Saratoga composed of some of the best Republicans in the city. This piece of "impudence" made the Custom-house furious, and the publication of the list of delegates was followed immediately by a letter from Mr. George Bliss, the District-Attorney, declaring that these primaries were in no sense an expression of the will of the people, but a "fraud" such as "Tammany in its palmiest days never perpetrated"; that in some districts the voting was done by a handful of people, in others by Democrats and non-residents, and in some not at all, not more than 500 votes having been cast in the whole city. To this Mr. Elwood E. Thorne, President of the Independent Central Committee, replies that Mr. Bliss's statements are "false," and adds that the falsehood is "wilful," and stakes his "character as a man of veracity" against that of Mr. Bliss, of whom he evidently has a low opinion. Perhaps the most remarkable part of the quarrel is that both sides evidently have in their minds as a standard a sort of ideal primary, composed of all the members of the party in a given district, convened in some solemn manner and in a public place to "select" delegates; the fact being that the "primary" as a rule is a small meeting of politicians in an out-of-the-way room, to which the party generally is not admitted, and the result of whose deliberations has generally been arranged in a still more private place and manner the day before. This work is generally done, and has been this year, by no other than our friend Bliss and his Custom-house associates; and the work having been done, he now makes his appearance in the newspapers as the defender of the "purity of the primaries."

The South Carolina Democrats, in the nomination of General Wade Hampton for the governorship, have shown that they possess their full share of the party capacity for blundering. This step will make it comparatively easy for the Radicals not to renominate Governor Chamberlain, and it is plain as possible that there is no man who can be elected who can

render the State, and especially the property-holders of the State, so much service as Governor Chamberlain. The corrupt element among the Radicals hate him, and will prevent his renomination if they can, but would probably have been forced to submit to it if the Conservatives had been wise and put off their nomination until the Radicals had made theirs. The platform on which General Hampton has been nominated contains all the things that proper platforms have to contain in these days—acceptance of the Constitutional Amendments and other results of the war, devotion to equal rights, love of peace and order, immeasurable hatred of theft, fraud, and other forms of villany, so that the only thing the Republican organs can say against it is that it is "hypocritical." General Hampton's letter of acceptance is equally unexceptionable, but then no letter or platform can make the General himself unexceptionable. No matter what views he may now hold as to expediency, he is neither a statesman nor a politician, nor a man of conciliatory disposition, nor anything but a soldier and Southern gentleman of the old school, to whom niggers, Yankees, schools, roads, free labor, and free speech are naturally almost as hateful as to the Pope himself. To put him up as a candidate, this of all years, on the eve of a Presidential election and close after the Hamburg massacre, seems to indicate a constitutional love of mischief.

Mr. Randall, just before the adjournment of Congress last week, made a speech reviewing the action of his party concerning the appropriations. He showed that the first difficulty the Democrats had met with had been the existence of a rule preventing the repeal or even modification of any law as to appropriations without a two-thirds vote; and that this rule, by the construction given it in practice, prevented reduction of expenditures but permitted their increase, and that any modification of this rule was stoutly resisted by the Republicans, and only secured by a strict party vote; that the Democrats, finding that 100,000 persons were receiving pay from the Federal Treasury, their salaries being fixed on the scale prevailing before the panic, proposed a reduction of ten per cent. on all salaries over \$1,200, and a reduction of 20 per cent. in the force of clerks and employés, proposing at the same time, in order that no harm might come from the reduction, that the hours of clerical labor should be permanently increased from six a day to seven; but that these reductions failed in great measure through the resistance of the Senate. With regard to the complaint made by the Republicans against the changes of law introduced under cover of appropriation bills, he showed that the same thing had been done by them in ten different cases. He pointed out also a growing abuse in the large amount of expenditures under the direction of executive officers without supervision by Congress, amounting now to some \$18,000,000 a year, suggested that this ought to be reformed next winter, and, finally, summed up the reductions effected by the present House at \$29,944,253.

We confess we think this is a very fair showing, and that in a good many other respects the "record" of this Democratic House of Representatives will bear comparison very well with that of most of its predecessors. It is the first House since the war which has shown the slightest appreciation of the demand of the country for retrenchment in the extravagant expenditures of the Government, and the first Congress for a long time that has brought its labors to a close decently and in order, without the usual log-rolling chaos. An enormous amount of abuse has been poured out upon the Democratic majority because they have made some discreditable appointments and because they have shown a disposition to inflate the currency. But this criticism, coming from the party which is responsible for all the currency shams of the past ten years, or from advocates of the silver swindle, many of whom are Republicans in good and regular standing, is rather nauseating. Considering the inexperience of the members and the financial ignorance so plentifully distributed throughout both parties, the session has been, on the whole, honest and creditable. The investigations conducted by the Democrats may

not have been ideal in their character, and may have been in many cases suggested by a base and cruel desire to find flaws in the administration of the Government and make use of them for the purpose of furthering Democratic interests. Investigations ought to be, as the Republican organs maintain, "calm, dispassionate, and patriotic," but then in order to have them so they would have to be conducted by investigators belonging to no political party. The main requisite in an investigation is that it should be thorough, and this the investigations conducted by the Democrats have been. We have no doubt that the Republicans could carry on investigations with a calm and dispassionate patriotism which would put all other investigators to the blush, but we have waited a good while for them to set about it, and, alas! we have seen no signs of their beginning.

One of the best things the Democratic majority did was to choose an honorable man for Speaker. The duty of a Speaker in these times is not merely that of a parliamentary presiding officer, but of a repressor of all sorts of underhand and illicit schemes for getting money out of the public purse. The control he has over legislation, through the appointment of committees and in other ways, is enormous, and it is almost every day in his power, by action or inaction, to kill or to pass a measure with "money in it." This has made it for the interest of the corruptionists to "control" the Speaker, and how far they can go we have seen in the exposure of Colfax's connection with the Crédit-Mobilier frauds and of Blaine's intimate relations with the Little Rock and Fort Smith lobby. In fact, the thing had reached a point at which it had almost become an understood thing that a sense of honor was no more to be expected in a Speaker than an absence of partisanship. The Democrats were under a great temptation to prolong this corrupt system by putting in a Speaker who would have been the tool of the lobby; but they resisted the temptation, and selected, in Mr. Kerr, one of their ablest and purest men, whose life has been sacrificed to his duty. The influence of this choice has been felt throughout the session, and has had the result of making it exceptionally free from the taint of questionable legislation of any kind. Mr. Kerr was, we believe, the only man in public life, investigated during the session, who not merely proved that the charges against him were unfounded, but came out of the ordeal with a reputation strengthened by the attacks made upon it.

Bishop Whipple of Minnesota is, perhaps, besides being one of the most laborious and self-denying men of his order, one of the wisest and best friends the Indians of the Northwest have ever had. He has just written a letter to the President on the Indian question which is interesting reading. He says the complete success of "the peace policy," as it is called, was prevented by the fact that it "was fettered by the faults and traditions of the old policy"; that a treaty was made after its adoption with the Indian tribes as an independent nation, reserving to them the Black Hills country, for the observance of which the faith of our Government was solemnly pledged; that this treaty was deliberately and shamefully violated; that the existing evils cannot be remedied by a transfer of the Indian Bureau to the War Department; that the Indian Bureau ought to be "an independent department of civilization, with one of the best men in the nation at its head," and if this were done, and the Indians had the protection of law, personal rights of property, and a place where they could live by the cultivation of the soil and other labor, and had schools and churches supplied them, and the national faith plighted to them were kept sacred, the Indian problem would be solved. He draws a striking picture of the contrast between our experience with the Indians and that of the Canadians. We have, he says, spent \$500,000,000 in Indian wars, and there is not one hundred miles between the Pacific and Atlantic which has not been the scene of an Indian massacre; we have never passed twenty years without an Indian war, and in the Centennial year we are having a very bloody one. On the other side of the line "there is the same greedy, dominant race and the same heathen, but they have never spent one dollar in an Indian war, and they have never had an Indian mas-

sacred." The reason of the difference, he says, lies in the fact that the British Indians "are subjects of Her Majesty"; have the same rights under the law as all others, and have the best men the Government can supply to teach them the ways of civilization. He winds up by suggesting the placing of all the Indians, as fast as they can be induced to settle, on ample reservations, with regular grants of land by patent of say one hundred acres as personal property to each Indian who shows a willingness to live by labor, the provision of a regular government for each reservation, with magistrates armed with summary powers, and an organized constabulary force. He tells one story which points the moral. Two years ago a "brute killed an Indian woman on the White Earth Reserve in open day." The Indians arrested him, took him to Fort Ripley, and asked for justice. In two months the Secretary of War ordered his discharge, having no legal authority to punish an Indian. Here was a lesson in civilization!

There has been a decline in the price of gold during the week from 111½ to 110½; in other words, United States notes for one dollar could be sold for gold as high as 90½ cents (\$0.9049), and at one time during the week would bring no more than 89½ cents (\$0.8968). Had the silver "dollar of our fathers" been in existence, it would have fluctuated between 90 cents and 86½ cents, the price of silver in London, which controls the price for the world, having continued variable. The fall in gold, as it is commonly called, was influenced by negotiations, which as we write are not completed, having in view the formation of a syndicate to undertake the negotiation of a part or the whole of the \$300,000,000 U. S. 4½ per cent. bonds authorized. Except the silver scheme, everything is favorable for the success of a 4½ per cent. bond. The efforts to commit one branch of Congress to that scheme at the recent session deprived the Government of the assistance in the 4½ per cent. negotiation of one of the most influential banks in the country, as well as a banking firm of large influence here and in Europe. The bankers, foreign and domestic, who are willing to undertake the work, do so on the calculation that even if the silver-dollar bill becomes a law next winter some restriction like limiting the legal-tender will be incorporated in it which will protect all bonds of the Government payable in "coin." The anthracite-coal combination was broken on Tuesday at a meeting of the Board of Control. The first step taken after dissolution was by the Delaware, Lackawanna, and Western, the Delaware and Hudson, the Reading, and the Pennsylvania Coal, which companies immediately announced that 500,000 tons of coal would be sold at auction for their account on the 29th. Without doubt there will be a heavy decline in the price of coal; the sound companies in the combination will derive benefits from enlarged sales which will compensate them for lower prices; the companies which transport as well as mine will gain most. The decline in the price of coal will cheapen manufactures and be a blessing to the public.

The Turkish question and the "Balham mystery," as the Bravo poisoning case is called, have occupied the English press and public almost to the exclusion of everything else for some time back. Of the Bravo case we gave a sketch in the letter of our London correspondent when it first attracted public attention. The first coroner's inquest, which was a hasty affair, did not satisfy Mr. Bravo's blood-relatives, and the Crown obtained an order for another from the Queen's Bench, which has been conducted in the most thorough manner, has played sad havoc with the characters of the Bravo household, and ended in a verdict of murder against some person or persons unknown. It has utterly demolished also a certain Dr. Gully, a well-known hydropathic and homoeopathic practitioner near London, revealing the fact that his relations with Mrs. Bravo were intimate and criminal up to her engagement with Bravo, and that at one time he, Dr. Gully, and she had agreed to contract what may be called a post-obit marriage—on the death, that is to say, of his wife, aged ninety; and that he actually prescribed for Mrs. Bravo after her marriage without her

husband's knowledge. Some of the parties, too, acknowledged having perjured themselves more or less on the first enquiry. Moreover, Dr. Gully was old, and Mrs. Bravo, then Mrs. Ricardo, a widow, sacrificed her relations with her mother and father in order to keep up her intercourse with him. The affair is altogether, in fact, a sombre picture of life in well-to-do circles, and as such has excited extraordinary interest in England, and brought together probably the largest assemblage of leading counsel ever seen at a coroner's inquest—it being the custom in England to employ a lawyer to "watch a case" which seems likely to reflect on one's character, where here one would publish a card in the papers requesting the public "to suspend its judgment" or "await further developments." Our plan, we need hardly say, is the cheapest.

The situation in Turkey seems to grow more and more unsatisfactory and threatening. The present Sultan has literally collapsed—that is, his nerves have given way under the excitement produced by his accession, his uncle's death, and the war, and he is now believed to be dying or imbecile, and there is a dispute among the pashas about his successor. The next heirs, under the Mahometan law, his two brothers, are said to be both unwilling to ascend the throne, none of the family apparently having any nerve left. In the meantime the interest in the crisis has been stimulated in England by a fresh default, this time on the loan of 1855; which was guaranteed by France and England, and on which they will now have to pay the interest. In the debate in the House of Commons on the attitude towards the belligerents to be assumed by England, of which the report has come out by the late mails, and in which Mr. Gladstone bore a prominent part, he took the ground that the greatest and best result of the Crimean war was not that it delivered Turkey from all risk of interference by foreign powers, but that it delivered her from the risk of interference on the part of Russia exclusively. He holds, however, that the failure of Turkey as a ruler of populations differing in creed from her ruling class is demonstrated, and that the only satisfactory way of dealing with her discontented provinces is the way in which they have one by one been dealt with hitherto, giving them local self-government. Good government by Mussulmans he evidently considers a chimera; and though he is not prepared for the sudden expulsion of the Turks from Constantinople, he thinks their power over all their outlying European provinces ought to be reduced to a mere suzerainty. Mr. Disraeli in his reply made a feeble defence of Turkish atrocities in Bulgaria, comparing them with those which have occurred in Christian countries, when recourse has been had to irregular troops to suppress insurrection. But nothing approaching them has occurred in Europe since the Thirty Years' War, and it is a burning disgrace to civilization that they should be permitted to occur now. That the Bashibazouks are irregulars is no excuse, because their character and mode of carrying on war are as well known as those of Sitting Bull and his forces. Mr. Disraeli also explained that the British fleet was not sent to Besika Bay to back up the Turks, but to show the world that it was part of British policy to keep the Mediterranean a free highway.

As to the operations in Servia, the accounts of them being telegraphic mostly, are vague and sometimes contradictory, but of the principal fact there seems to be no doubt, and that is that Kerim Pasha, the Commander-in-Chief, a man of considerable energy and ability, has retired from Gurgasovatz, and swinging round his left wing under Eyoub Pasha, has outflanked the Servian army at Banza, and forced it to retire on Alexinatz, where its position, according to the last accounts, was assailed in heavy force on Sunday, and according to the Servian version, the Turks were repulsed; but according to the Turkish version, a portion of the Servian position at least was carried, and according to both, the attack was renewed on Monday, with what result is not known at this writing. If Alexinatz is once lost or abandoned, there is no reason why the flanking process should not be continued until Tcherniaeff is shut up in Belgrade. In the meantime, there are rumors of an insurrection in Crete, and of consequent agitation in Athens.

THE PROBABLE PLACE OF THE SOUTH IN NATIONAL POLITICS.

THE Boutwell report, the President's letter to Governor Chamberlain, the recent order of the Secretary of War, and the prominent use made in the canvass of the charge that the bulk of the white population at the South either take pleasure in killing and outraging negroes, or have no objection to having it done by others, and are generally hostile to peace and order, are all among the things which, in a greater or less degree, are helping to reproduce what was before the war the great evil of American politics. We mean the hardening of the Southern vote into a compact mass on one question—the negro question—and the utter indifference of the Southern public to the various other issues by which opinion at the North is now or is likely to be hereafter divided.

It was not unnatural that the Republican party should have been alarmed by the attitude towards the freedmen taken up by the various Southern legislatures after the war, and not unnatural or unwise that it should have resolutely carried out such constitutional legislation as might have seemed necessary to prevent the restoration either of slavery or of any modification of slavery. Nor was it improper to legislate in execution of the Constitutional Amendments for the protection of the newly-made voters in the free exercise of the franchise. The Reconstruction process was, on the whole, as little objectionable as any attempt to deal with such a state of things could reasonably have been expected to be. But, once it was over, everything in the power of the North ought to have been done to conciliate the Southern whites and to draw them into the arena of national politics, and destroy the sectional feeling and the morbid irritability about negroes which brought on the war. If legislation was attempted, it ought to have been careful and considerate. We ought not to have attempted the insane task of making newly-emancipated field-hands, led by barbers and barkeepers, fancy they knew as much about government, and were as capable of administering it, as the whites. We ought to have discouraged instead of encouraging their confidence in disreputable Northern adventurers. We ought, through the character of our Federal officials, to have sought to exercise a soothing influence on the whites and an enlightening influence on the blacks. We ought, when showing our regard for order by sending down troops, to have taken all possible precautions to prevent their being used by local politicians for electioneering purposes, or used by any one in such a way as to weaken popular respect for the civil authorities or for the ordinary processes of law; and then, when Southern men began to make their appearance in Congress, everything ought to have been done to welcome them back and encourage their participation in politics as American citizens. Instead of this, however, taunts, drawn from the memories of the rebellion, have been from the very outset a favorite Republican weapon of debate against them, and they have been used as if the object in view was to convince Southerners that they would not be permitted to take part on equal terms in any general legislation. We might fill pages with illustrations of this. One or two must suffice. Senator Gordon, of Georgia, made an excellent speech in favor of civil-service reform and proposed a very practical and praiseworthy measure of reform. This ought to have been hailed with delight as an excellent symptom. But what happened? Why, he was overwhelmed with ridicule and abuse for talking of reforming "the Government he had sought to destroy," his chief opponent being the upright Mr. Morton, who changes his opinions on all leading questions about every four years, and is as ferocious on one side as the other. So also, when the Democratic House of Representatives did what the Republicans have done, and would do again—put in new officers of the House—they were incessantly scolded, not for making the change, but for giving places to ex-Confederate soldiers—that is, to what is now the best class of Southern society for all the purposes of civil life. That a man who took part in the Rebellion ought never again to hold office is a com-

prehensible and defensible doctrine, but it was formally abandoned by the amnesty; and acting on it now, or preaching it now, when union and oblivion are the two foremost needs of our politics, is mischievous as well as malignant.

When the session opened up came the memories of the Rebellion again, the leading Republican candidate for the Presidency being foremost in their use in discussions on all conceivable subjects. If a Southern member objected to high taxation, he was told that it was his wickedness and that of his friends which made high taxation necessary. If he sought the simplification of the tariff, he was told that when the tariff was framed he was in the field trying to overturn the Government. If he asked for civil-service reform, he learned that if he had had his way there would have been no civil service to reform. If he served on a committee of investigation, he was assured that an "ex-rebel colonel or general" ought not to examine the accounts of a man "whose heart had always beaten warmly for his native land"; and things bid fair to reach a point at which when a Northern politician was accused of stealing or jobbing he would at once begin to make out lists of "outrages" committed on negroes by his accuser's "friends." Some of the debates which Mr. Blaine got up in the early part of the present session on these and cognate themes, indeed, bore more resemblance to the recrimination about conduct and family antecedents which may sometimes be heard on the stairs of a tenement-house between two Biddies, than to the argumentation of a civilized legislature. We are glad to remember that these tactics did not triumph at Cincinnati. Candidates who relied on them found themselves miserably deceived, and are now sitting sadder and wiser "on back seats in the rear car." Mr. Hayes has not indulged in such follies, and in his letter speaks of the South in a rational and considerate tone. But many of his supporters show no abatement of the old spirit, and are doing what in them lies to saddle this nation once more with a burden over which our children's children may have to mourn. Secretary Cameron's order, for instance, is not in substance objectionable. In view of the fact that there is to be a very exciting election in States in which the preponderance of physical force is not on the side of the State government, it may be very well as a measure of precaution to quarter in the South as many troops as can be spared. But to publish an order to this effect, purporting to be issued under a resolution of the House of Representatives condemning intimidation at elections, and recommending "the prompt prosecution and punishment, in every court having jurisdiction," of outrages committed by persons of one race or class on those of another, has the air of a joke intended solely for purposes of irritation. It will undoubtedly be so regarded in the region to which the order is applicable, and its perpetration by a high officer of the Government in the discharge of an official duty as savoring of indecency.

The full gravity of the Republican policy toward the South is, we are glad to say, beginning to show itself before its mischief is irretrievable. We shall probably see it in a palpable shape at the coming election. We shall see the complete failure of the attempt to give the blacks the same political weight as the whites, and to make out of them a separate political party, hostile to the whites. It was from the first a silly attempt, doubly silly when made through the use of troops. If it had succeeded it would have proved not only that the lessons of history were all false, but that civilization was a mere dream. We shall see, too, the whites bringing all the Southern States, except perhaps South Carolina, into the field "solid," not for certain views of the questions which divide us at the North, but, as in the old slavery days, for the party or candidate which seems most likely to let it alone on the negro question. We shall see it too, probably, so nearly holding the balance of power that a single doubtful Northern State like New York will turn the scale. Let the whites get hold of South Carolina in their present temper, as they will in time, and they will probably hold the balance of power absolutely. We shall then, as before, have a herd of politicians springing up at the North seeking power by pandering to the South, and have "the South" once more talked

of, as it used to be, as a political devil, which has to be placated by various offerings and modes of worship, and holds a veto over every useful piece of legislation, and use the Northern politicians as puppets for its own purposes, and is ready to reinforce almost any party at the North through which it can make its power for evil or its arrogance tell.

Considerations like these have driven thousands who have hitherto acted with the Republican party to the sorrowful conclusion that deliverance can only come through its complete expulsion from office, and that, of the two evils—four years of Democratic administration, or a continuance of the régime which has, after eleven years' labor, left the South in its present threatening condition—the first is the less. Their apprehensions are not likely to be quieted by the appearance of such men as Mr. Boutwell on the scene as a ghostly counsellor of incoherent folly, or by seeing the army handled in a jocose spirit about election time by an obscure young gentleman like Mr. Cameron, armed with the functions of Secretary of War. The Republican managers ought to know that they have not a vote to spare, that the time for jaunty confidence is past, and that, if they mean to win, *they* must have discretion, however indiscreet the other side may be.

CAMPAIGN CHARGES.

THE hope entertained by a good many quiet people that the present Presidential campaign was to be marked by an absence of the customary "charges," countercharges, and "exposures," is evidently not destined to be fulfilled. We have not now got very far along in it, and yet in both parties the number of prominent men who have been and are undergoing the most searching examination as to their past lives, particularly into their business relations, into their administration of trusts, their dealing with money confided to their keeping, their management of commercial enterprises, and, in a word, into their honesty, is very great. Before the nominations all the leading Republican candidates were subjected to this ordeal, and the most formidable of them, Mr. Blaine, failing to pass it, lost his nomination. The pecuniary honesty of Morton and Conkling was put forward by their friends as constituting a strong claim upon the succession, and Morton, who had the good luck a few weeks before the Convention to have the question raised, and satisfactorily set at rest, whether he had not embezzled money from the State of which he was the "favorite son," was felt to have had his chances materially improved. The strongest point in Hayes's favor in the Convention was, not that he was in favor of civil-service reform, hard money, or the one-term idea, but that he was a man against whom no "charges" ever had or could be made. In the Democratic Convention, Mr. Tilden was subjected to the same severe test, and his friends were obliged to meet and repel in his case the most serious and comprehensive array of accusations ever brought against any public man in the history of the country. Since the campaign has opened the same thing has been kept up vigorously. "Charges" of some kind have been brought against almost every Republican official of any prominence. The Republicans in reply have brought forward again the whole series of accusations against Mr. Tilden, most damaging if true, for the object of showing that instead of being a reformer he is a canting hypocrite, and instead of being an honest man he is a swindler who has been engaged for years in playing the part of a "railroad wrecker"—i.e., in cheating the owners of railroad stocks and bonds out of their property.

We are far from thinking that this peculiarity of our present condition of politics is a bad one, or one to be regretted. It is, indeed, so natural and inevitable a result of their present state that it would be folly to quarrel with its manifestation. The corruption in which we have been plunged since the war has been so complete, and it has so thoroughly soaked into the character of the whole political class, that the first thing we want to know about any candidate who is put forward as a reformer is whether he is or is not a

"part of the thing to be reformed." The crying evils in politics now are, not less than the condition of the currency and the civil service, the degraded condition of the minds and aims of the political class, which prevents such questions as the currency and the civil service from receiving honest consideration. We have no more reason to believe that Grant, Conkling, Morton, or Cameron would ever really set about reforming the system of patronage or bringing about resumption, than we have to expect a suppression of public gaming from John Morrissey and a convention of gamblers. The conviction of this has, we believe, sunk very deeply into people's minds, and accounts in a great measure for the slightly derisive indifference with which the campaign against the Catholics, begun by Blaine and Grant, has been received by the public. Politics has, it must be confessed, sunk to a low level in any country in which a greater part of it consists in the dissemination and examination of "charges"; but the very fact that it does so largely consist of them proves that their low tone arises from the low tone of the men who conduct them, and that the first step in reform is the weeding out, by means of just such a process of investigation and exposure as we are now going through, and have been going through for the last four years, of our whole crop of rascals.

Like all other political arts, that of making "charges" is liable to great abuse, and there are some signs already of a disposition to cultivate the manufacture, very much like that of "outrages," in cold blood. The only interest in the matter which the general public has is in knowing whether the accusations are true or not; but to the political managers it makes less difference whether they are true than whether they are difficult to answer. For their purposes a vague charge, which it is difficult to reduce to specifications, and therefore difficult to answer up and down, and which can on this very account be kept afloat for a long time, is often better than a charge which can be met and disposed of out of hand. It is obvious, too, that in the present campaign this sort of charge is a weapon now more likely to be found in the hands of the Republicans than of the Democrats. The latter have no need to manufacture capital of this kind, because the recent history of the Republicans has furnished them with a series of scandals of which the proof is always easily attainable and the facts undeniable. If the Democrats were to merely publish a list of the Republican politicians, North and South, Cabinet officers, internal-revenue collectors, postmasters, gaugers, weighers, and tide-waiters who, during the past eight years, have been either impeached, indicted, investigated, removed, reprimanded, or so thoroughly "exposed" as to be obliged to retire from public life, the list would constitute a rogues' gallery whose length would startle the scoundrels themselves. The Republicans, however, have little or no ammunition of this kind. The Democrats have been out of power for nearly twenty years, and have consequently been deprived of all those means for corruption of which the Republicans have made such good use. For this reason, the Republicans are rather at their wit's end to know how to meet the charges brought against them by their enemies; and it is to be expected that they will take refuge in accusations of a much vaguer sort. And this we find to be the case. The "intimidation" of negroes, the general "disloyalty" of the party, the "identity" of the present Democratic party with the Democratic party which "brought on the war," the complicity of its present leaders in the frauds of Tammany Hall, and, finally, the general "cussedness" of all Democrats, their moral degradation, liking for liquor, antipathy to "good men," and fondness for brawling, fighting, and general deviltry, are the charges now generally employed; and it must be confessed that they are rather stale when compared with those on the other side.

We have been led to this train of reflection by looking over a "campaign edition" of the *Times*, which is the only Republican paper of prominence in the East which has gone into the present campaign with positive fervor. The "campaign edition" consists almost entirely of "charges," most of them rather vague, but to strengthen these it brings forward and puts into shape

those against Mr. Tilden in a more complete and circumstantial way than they have ever been brought forward before, and which shows that it considers them an unanswerable reply to the bribery, corruption, and fraud which have been proved to be so rife in the Republican "machine." These charges against Mr. Tilden deserve some attention, because they affect the character of a man who, it is not at all unlikely, will be for four years President of the country. They are supposed to go to the root of his character, and to show him to be not merely unfit for public life but for a decent position of any kind. They are said, in fact, to show his whole career to be one of chicanery, fraud, and robbery, and to exhibit him as only differing from a man like Fisk, Jr., or Jay Gould in not having openly thrown off all restraint. We have carefully examined the principal one of these charges, in fact, the only one brought forward in a tangible form, which relates to the St. Louis, Alton, and Terre Haute Railroad, and find that it rests on these facts:

In 1859, some seventeen years ago, there was a Western railroad, called the Terre Haute, Alton, and St. Louis Railroad, which got into difficulties, and could not pay the interest on its bonds. The bondholders determined to foreclose the mortgages under which the bonds were issued and reorganize the road. They accordingly appointed Mr. Tilden and several other gentlemen, who were selected on account of their knowledge of law or their skill in railroad matters, to do the business for them. These gentlemen, forming what was called the "Purchasing Committee" of the road, bought the road in at a foreclosure sale, and sold it again to a new reorganized company, receiving in return new securities, which they were to distribute among their principals on the basis of agreements made with them. They issued these new securities to the old creditors as long as any creditors appeared to claim them. There were at the end of these proceedings a number of securities still undistributed, which the Purchasing Committee divided among themselves, either for their services or for other reasons satisfactory to the parties concerned. It does not appear that there was any concealment of these facts, or any complaint made by anybody to whom Mr. Tilden or his co-purchasers stood in the relation of trustees.

Indeed, so far from this being the case, the Purchasing Committee, while having under their agreements the right to exclude any persons from the benefits of the reorganization after June, 1861, took no advantage of this right, but admitted claimants down to 1863, and have never excluded anybody. Besides this, they say that, in purchasing the road in their own name, they assumed heavy liabilities, some of which are still outstanding; that they performed many services for which they could get no remuneration except from the surplus in their hands; that the whole remuneration arising from this surplus would not pay each member of this Committee at the outside three-quarters or one per cent. of the nominal amount of the securities which passed through the hands of the Committee—a small remuneration; that the net result of the whole operation was to greatly benefit the road, advancing the securities from twice to eight times as much as they were worth before.

The present managers of the road, who are not the persons who employed Mr. Tilden, and have, so far as it appears, no relation with him of any kind, now make a claim upon him and the members of the Committee for an account, to which he and the other members reply that it is none of their business. One of the members of the Committee has very frankly told the plaintiffs that he does not pretend to understand the legal rights of the matter, that he has a number of the bonds, and is perfectly willing to surrender them if ordered to do so by any competent authority. The only question apparently involved in the case is one purely legal, whether there is any relation of principal and agent or trustee and beneficiary existing between the Purchasing Committee and the road as it at present exists which authorizes an accounting between them, and the litigation is of a kind to which any lawyer might unavoidably become a party. The road says there is; Mr. Tilden and the other members of the Committee say there is not, and naturally decline to give up their books. It is

obvious that in doing this they simply act so as to guard their own rights, for it must be remembered that they admit the existence of persons to whom they did stand in the relation of agents; and if they have any property in their possession for which they owe any account, it may be to these principals that they owe it, and if they do not want to pay it twice over to two different sets of people, they must resist with every means in their power the claim now made upon them. There are no *indicia* of fraud about the case, and, so far as appears, its use by Republican organs, in its present unsettled state, to prove Mr. Tilden a railroad "robber" or "shark," is a scandalous abuse of the power of the press.

We have gone into this "charge" at considerable length, because it illustrates the straits to which the Republicans have reduced themselves for campaign powder. In the present campaign, all the benefit that can be extracted from "charges" will be reaped by the Democrats, who can prove by undeniable evidence a corruption in the dominant party of the most gigantic extent, widespread throughout all the departments of Government, and practically encouraged by its head. The Republicans are perfectly entitled, if they can do it, to show that under Hayes this sort of thing will come to an end, that he will elevate and purify the public service and redeem the reputation of his party; they have a perfect right to show, if they can, that he will, notwithstanding the bitter opposition of all the chiefs of his own party, reform the civil service, and that he will bring about resumption in 1879, and that the Democrats have the disadvantage of struggling with an inflation element in their own party. But they will do well to be very cautious in their use of "charges," because, if the campaign were only a question of these, there can be no doubt in any honest man's mind that the party would be driven out of power in a storm of disgust.

THE CONDITION OF THE NAVY.

II.—NAVY YARDS AND SUPPLIES.

THE management of navy yards and its effect on the *personnel* of the navy are matters of deep interest to the public, and yet there are few subjects on which such ignorance and indifference are displayed. The promulgation of the political doctrine that "to the victors belong the spoils" was the commencement of a change in navy-yard administration which has gradually developed into a system, most pernicious in its effects, having now the force of long-established custom. Theoretically, navy-yard administration consists of a representative of each bureau of the Department (usually a captain or commander in rank) in immediate charge of all that pertains to that bureau, under the supreme control of a commandant (usually a rear-admiral or commodore.) The arrangement would be admirable if the orders of the Department really were issued by or received the scrutiny or attention of the Secretary or any other controlling head. This not being the case, it is itself faulty, since the individual chiefs of bureaux often act inharmoniously and sometimes in opposition to each other's purposes and wishes. The consequence is lack of responsibility, confusion, and jealousy; the result, waste of money and inefficiency. But the faultiness of the theory sinks into insignificance when compared with the abuses in practice. "Wherever a navy yard is located, a member of Congress, whose constituency is located in that vicinity and district, has, in many respects, the command of that navy yard. . . . The commandant and other officials connected with it . . . have little or nothing to say about the taking on or the discharging of master-workmen, of foremen, or other mechanics. . . . The member of Congress or a committee of the party in power regulates the appointment, admission, and discharge of the mechanics and workmen," and, in fact, all labor of every kind. This political control is carried to such an extent that the navy yards are commonly referred to as "Sargent's yard," "Platt's yard," etc.; and, incredible as it may appear, it is even exercised in the selection of persons from whom the sailors *must* buy their "little luxuries," such as "fresh bread, fruit," etc. Such is the unanimous opinion of those who are in the best position to judge, although expressed in a variety of ways and generally with less candor. The Congressman controls in order to secure his reelection and enrich his friends; to accomplish these objects, he has resorted to divers methods of maintaining his hold on the "workers." The "eight-hour law" was passed solely through the influence of navy-yard employes, who receive for eight hours' detention and idleness the same wages paid skilful

and faithful workmen for ten hours' hard work in private establishments. Large sums of money have been appropriated for carrying on unimportant, often useless works, in order to furnish pay for pretended employment of political supporters. It has been asserted that any determined effort on the part of naval officers to remove the yards from political control will be met by reduction of their number and pay; and it is believed by the well-informed that no appropriation could be obtained without the aid and influence of those Congressmen whose personal interests are involved.

Under the present system, the commandant and his subordinates have no power to punish or dismiss, consequently idleness, insolence, theft, waste, and destruction of Government property go unpunished. Mechanics and others are selected for employment or retention not on account of fitness but for partisan services, and are very frequently employed on work of which they have no knowledge whatever. In brief, the appropriation for the maintenance of the *matériel* of the navy is diverted to the base purpose of bribing voters to support the dominant party. The system was commenced by Democrats, has been skilfully improved on by Republicans, and will be continued by whichever party is in power unless the "reform element" can obtain control. The chief reason why it is not more vigorously exposed is that a certain proportion of the patronage is given to the Randalls and others of the minority as a reward for their blindness.

"The abuses of navy yards are so manifold that chapters could be written and still the subject left unfinished." Under the existing political system, the construction and repair of vessels, etc., by navy-yard labor cost almost double the amount for which they could be done under contract, although navy-yard work is more satisfactory. "Contracts have been given frequently of late to build ships, place machinery in them, etc., 'with the facilities of the yard,' which leaves the contractor a wide margin in making demands by which a large portion of the work is done by the Government that he, by his contract, should do." This is certainly an ingenious combination of the worst features of both systems, in order that the favorite may get his "fat" contract and the Congressman his patronage. The result is excessive expenditure for inferior work; and the navy proper is robbed of its appropriations while being burdened with abortions. Among existing causes of extravagance there is one which is "palpably absurd." This is the multiplication of mechanical shops, so that each bureau of the yard may have one of each kind. Thus we find in each yard "half-a-dozen blacksmith-shops, carpenter-shops, machine-shops, etc., . . . with an idle foreman in each and not a workman in any; when by a common-sense arrangement (having but one shop of each sort) a great deal of work could be got out of the same money which now yields nothing." From page 28 of the document we condense the following, and urge its careful consideration:

"The separate branches in the navy yards are besides very expensive organizations. Draughtsmen, clerks, writers, messengers, office laborers, and the like have been greatly multiplied since 1860, and are greatly in excess of the real wants of the service. . . . The duties in the several corps are no more difficult and arduous now than they were in 1860, and it would be well to return to the civil-service lists of the navy of that year as a guide for reductions" afloat and ashore. "Officers have been taught to write, . . . and there are many positions where the officer should himself keep the books and do the little writing required in his office. . . . Nearly every head of a corps at a navy yard and on shipboard has a largely-increased *personnel*, a separate office, and conducts business with a seemingly entire disregard of proper economy and the true interests of the public service. . . . These civil appointments and employments have been for a number of years apparently recognized and sanctioned by direct appropriations by Congress, and in some instances *members of Congress, representing districts in which navy yards are located, have tried to have appropriations of this character increased beyond the submitted estimates of the Department.*"

It is needless to quote further evidence of necessity for reform. The remedy unanimously suggested is: Restore to commandants and their *naval* subordinates the absolute power of appointment and discharge that has been usurped by Congressmen. Hold them strictly responsible for the quality and quantity of work performed. Consolidate all mechanical shops into one of each branch in each yard. Create permanent corps of foremen, selected for ability and character, who shall retain their positions for life or during good behavior, and be suspended or dismissed only on the recommendation of a board similar in organization to summary courts-martial. Abolish all so-called watchmen, and turn over the police duties to the marine corps, which would then become a valuable adjunct of the navy. There is no reform of the civil service more needed, and none that will require a higher standard of patriotism to accomplish.

The Committee also solicited opinions as to the relative importance of the different yards and the necessity of their maintenance. On these subjects there is great divergence of views; but the majority seem to favor the

abolition and sale of the navy yards at New London and Boston or Kittery; the reduction of that at Washington to a manufacturing establishment for machinery, ordnance, and ground-tackle; the retention and improvement of those at New York, Norfolk, Pensacola, Mare Island, and League Island. New York, Norfolk, and Mare Island are considered the most important; the first, for its resources; the second, its capacity, climate, and position; the last, on account of its being the only one on the Pacific coast. These three yards are deemed ample for existing needs of the service, now reduced to a minimum; but in the event of a war, even with Spain, they would afford very limited facilities for the outfit and repair of an efficient navy. The greatest deficiency seems to be in dry-docks, there being only three in all the yards, while there are many dock-yards in Europe with double this number in each.

Theoretically, supplies for the navy are obtained under the well-known contract system; practically, they are procured from or through a "ring," in combination with a coterie of Congressmen who control the Secretary, the Department, and the yards. The conviction that frauds are practised and gross abuses prevail in the purchase and inspection of supplies is almost universal among naval officers. Why, then, do they not seek the evidence and expose the guilty? If after six months of rigid scrutiny into the official acts of the Secretary and his associates by two committees of an Opposition Congress no positive evidence has been obtained which would convict them of crime, is it to be supposed that their naval subordinates could procure such evidence? Without it, no accusation could be sustained, and therefore none has been made. The following, from page 7 of the document, affords an insight into the methods of obtaining supplies and the helplessness of officers to prevent abuses: "I have heard it stated many, very many times, and with semblance of truth, that officers of the navy have inspected stores and material furnished by contractors, and also inspected work performed, and rejected them, and refused payment on account of not coming up to the standard as specified in contracts. The Secretary of the Navy has, notwithstanding this, ordered the stores and material to be received and payment made for work performed. But in these cases it has been as often alleged, and with semblance of truth, too, that members of Congress, friends of the contractors, press upon and force the Secretary to this action." There is a solemn earnestness in this which commands attention. The remedy suggested is: To receive bids from manufacturers *only* who are willing to guarantee the articles furnished, and who should be excluded from all future contracts if they do not come up to the standard; to have all purchased articles and work done outside of the yards inspected by a board of naval *line* officers, aided by experts from the staff corps, whose decision shall be final in all cases where the articles or work is rejected.

In connection with the silence of officers as to the real condition of the navy and their failure to ferret out abuses and corrupt practices, the attention of Congress is called to the provisions of Sections 1,442 and 1,557 of the Revised Statutes, which confer on the Secretary the absolute power to place any officer on "furlough"; in other words, to inflict the severest punishment short of dismissal for an *indefinite period* without being required to assign his reasons or account to any one in any way for his action. Such a prerogative conferred on any individual in any other country would be cited as an instance of despotic government, and held up to the scorn of our "free and independent people."

AUSTRIA'S EMBARRASMENTS.

PARIS, July 23, 1876.

THE difficulties of Turkey are of a double kind. I showed in my last letter the character of the traditional antagonism of Russia and Turkey: how the Russians are drawn towards the Christians by their religion, towards Constantinople by their ambition. The study of the relations of Turkey with her European neighbors would, however, not be complete if, besides the Czar, we did not consider Hungary and Austria. It is a source of perpetual astonishment to the reader of the great historical works of D'Aubigné and De Thou to see what importance was attached in past times to the alliance or to the enmity of the Grand Sultan. What even now makes Hungary so important is the memory of her long and continual struggles against the Turks. There was a time when the whole valley of the Danube might have become a possession of the Osmanlis. The Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire was entrusted with the defence of this valley, and, so to speak, the protection of all Europe against the infidels. Vienna and Pesth were the vanguards of civilization against the infidels. Thus Austria was created and formed not around a distinct nationality; on the contrary, it became a nucleus of Christian nationalities. What now makes Austria's weakness was once her strength: Italians, Germans,

Slavs belonging to the Russian Orthodox Church, Magyars, Croats, Bohemians, Poles—all were united in one common idea: the defence of the Christian faith, the defence of the great valley of the Danube.

It must not be thought, however, that a complete and perfect union was always maintained among the confederates. Even in the XVIIIth century traces of the modern divisions can be found; but times always came when the sentiment of a common danger threw a veil over the natural passions of the Latins, the Magyars, the Slavs, the Germans. As the sentiment of this danger became weaker, these passions became stronger. The world was astonished to find, in 1840, how much hatred was felt towards the Magyars by the Slavonic populations; Jellachich was among the most dangerous enemies of the so-called Hungarian independence. When Austria was defeated at Sadowa, and was turned out of the German Confederation by the hand of Prussia, she abandoned the system of centralization in a moment of reaction against German ideas, and invented the system of dualism, which makes two empires in one empire—*imperio in imperio*. Hungary became the true leader of the new Austria, and the consequence of it has been this: the German provinces have been more and more strongly drawn towards the successful empire founded by Bismarck and the Hohenzollern. Vienna is, in many respects, more Borussia than Borussia: the press of Vienna is in the hands of enterprising Jews, who cannot help being more attracted towards the enemies of Ultramontanism than towards the old Austrian party, which, impotent as it is, still represents ideas, regrets, and hopes which are adverse to the modern German *Kultur*. The ascendancy of Hungary has not been without its inconveniences. The Magyars, with their usual pride and love of expenditure, have plunged the Trans-Leithanian part of the empire into debt; new taxes have to be paid to meet the interest on this extravagant debt; the Slavs are discontented, not only in Bohemia, but in all the southern and eastern parts of the old Hungarian kingdom.

The state of things at Vienna and at Pesth is such that a friend of mine, who knows Austria as well as possible, said to me, more than six months ago, when the small match of Herzegovina was burning: "This Eastern Question which is rekindled is in reality directed against Austria more than against Turkey. Turkey will always get out of it, as she has done before, by fire and sword, and by the help of the jealousies of the Great Powers; but Austria seems to me very unwise in helping or seeming to help the discontented parties of the Turkish Empire. If the war breaks out, she will be more endangered than anybody; if she makes an intervention in favor of the Christians oppressed by the Turks, she will rouse the enthusiasm of the Slavonians in her own empire, but these Slavonic populations can hardly be contented without a derangement of the dualistic system invented by Beust; the Hungarians will do as much as is in their power to preserve their ascendancy at Pesth, and will therefore resist all political movements which would be too favorable to the Slavonians." Some time ago, before the insurrection of Servia, at the time of the so-called Andrássy Note, it was generally believed that Austria intended to occupy Bosnia; but at that time nobody expected any energetic action from England. Austria allowed herself to be dragged unwillingly into the agreement which ended in the Gortchakoff Memorandum. It was clear that if Russia was to occupy Bulgaria with the permission of Germany, the best thing Austria could do was to occupy Bosnia and Servia. Since that time great changes have taken place. Austria had not rejoiced much in the idea of a joint occupation of the northern provinces of Turkey; she remembered still the drama of the Danish Duchies: she had entered there also with the German brothers, and what had the end been? Sadowa, and the final annexation of the Duchies to Prussia.

The German Chancellor did not seem unwilling now that, the Gortchakoff Memorandum failing in its effects (and it could but fail and was intended to fail), the Russians and Austrians should make a sort of *execution* of Turkey, just as the Duchies had been *executed*. He probably foresaw that this execution would end either in a war between Austria and Turkey or in such territorial changes that Germany could make new propositions concerning the German provinces of Austria. The position of Prussia was excellent; she remained as a witness and a judge at the same time; offering advice to both parties, biding her time, the arbiter of the destinies of Europe. The position of Austria was not so clear; her finances were in a miserable state; she had not yet got over the effects of the famous "Krach"; her army was reorganized, but the various races of the empire were secretly or openly inimical. Austria signed the Memorandum with some reluctance, as a man who is hard pressed for money signs a bill.

The resistance of England was an unexpected pleasure for Austria—a pleasure which was all the sweeter that she had to conceal it. Beust, who had long waited for an opportunity to extricate himself from the

close alliance of the Northern Powers, has at last found it; he has become a *persona grata* in London, and has not been without some influence on the unexpected determination of Disraeli and of Lord Derby. The refusal of England to enter as second fiddle into the concert of the Emperors, and the presence of a formidable English fleet in the Bay of Besika, has given an entirely new aspect to the Eastern Question. The Sultan and his Christian subjects have been left, so to speak, in a ring which nobody will enter. What the result will be it is not difficult to foresee. Once more the Turkish provinces will be overrun with a soldiery half maddened by religious passions. The unfortunate Christians are not only left to themselves, they are divided among themselves. The inheritance of the Sick Man is coveted by races which are hostile to each other; the Latins of Roumania as well as the Hellenes have shown the greatest indifference to the sufferings of the Slavonians. If ever the Turks are obliged to abandon their supremacy, the difficulty will be to find a suitable plan for the division of the provinces between the three races. When the kingdom of Greece was founded it was made too small; Thessaly and Macedonia, which ought naturally to belong to it, are still in the hands of the Turks. The Greeks have long looked upon the Russians as their natural protectors; but since the Crimean war, since the insurrection of Crete especially, they have become afraid of their patrons. They hope some day to possess Constantinople, and look upon Byzantium as their natural prey: while the unfortunate Bulgarians are treated with the most cruel severity, while the Servians are fighting against hope, the young sovereign of Greece is quietly travelling in Europe, and can be seen in all the theatres and museums. Greece is folding her arms and remains absolutely inactive.

Roumania is now in possession of the lower part of the Danube; the young Hohenzollern who has become its ruler is said to be intelligent; he is doing his best to introduce civilization in Moldavia and Wallachia, but his new state has not much to expect from war. It is a creation of diplomacy; it can only be strengthened by diplomacy. While the Slavonians are fighting, Charles of Hohenzollern is drawing notes and memorandums; he wants a more complete autonomy, the right to coin money, and the mouth of the Danube. Diplomacy hardly condescends to occupy itself at present with these pretensions. The whole interest of the Eastern drama is, therefore, centred in the struggle between the Servians and Montenegrins on one side, and the Turks on the other. Even Servia and Montenegro do not seem to be perfectly united, and we may expect to see the princes of these two countries make what is called in diplomacy their *separate* peace with their Mussulman lord.

The Servians thought that they could play the same part which Piedmont has played in Italy; but they have found no ally. France is impotent and cannot help them. The Government of Belgrade, in its terrible enterprise, has been obliged to accept the services of men who are considered in St. Petersburg as revolutionists. Prince Gortchakoff said not long ago: "Greatly as I like the oppressed Christians, I like one thing more—it is the throne of my august master." General Tcherniaeff is considered by the rulers of Russia as a dangerous character; the young men who have been placed in power at Belgrade have most of them been educated in Paris, and have brought to their native country the jargon of the Quartier Latin. The lady who joined the Servian army in the sensational dress of an Amazon, has been put forward as a living representative of the Revolution.

So it happens that all is joined against the insurgents—the army of the Sultan, the fanaticism of the religious Mussulmans, the English fleet off Besika, the terrors of the conservative governments, the indifference of some, and the hatred of others. And notwithstanding all these reasons, the Servians have begun and are continuing the struggle, merely counting on the vague aspirations and sympathies of the Pan Slavist party in Austria and in Russia.

Pan Slavism is like a dream which cannot get embodied: that it will some day find its visible and tangible expression I fully believe. Germanism has come out of the clouds. There was a time when it was said that the French were masters of the land, the English of the water, and the Germans of the air; but this can hardly be said now: the age of the professors has been succeeded by the age of the soldiers. Grossdeutschland does not wear now the small cap of a drunken student, it wears the helmet of the ancient Romans. Pan Slavism is not come out of its first embryonic state; and though we live in a fast world of railways and telegrams, it may take centuries to give its definite shape to the huge monster which covers the eastern part of Europe. We may not live to see this new civilization, which, in the opinion of the Pan Slavist writers, will supersede our old and effete civilization; and perhaps we shall not even live to see the Crescent off the walls of Saint Sophia and the Turks consigned to Asia Minor.

Correspondence.

THE "GROVELLING MORTALS" VIEW OF THE SILVER QUESTION.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION :

SIR : After reading your very severe strictures on the advocates of the retention of silver as money, I cannot refrain from asking :

First : Whether the evidence is clear that the present relative value of silver and gold is all due to a *fall* in silver, or whether it is not in some measure due to a *rise* in gold ?

If the whole world were to demonetize silver, it would undoubtedly fall very greatly in value, not only in relation to gold, but in relation to commodities generally.

But it is quite as certain that gold, having the whole work to perform for which both metals were before used, would greatly appreciate in value in relation to all commodities ; and to the extent that the demonetization of silver is carried, to that extent is there a tendency to appreciate gold and with it to augment the burden of all debts payable in gold.

Second : When our national debt was created, it was well known to all the world that it was payable in the two metals, at the rate of 371 $\frac{1}{4}$ grains of one and 22.23 of the other to the dollar. Suppose, instead of being an agreement to pay coin, it had been an agreement to pay a given sum in cotton at ten cents a pound or wool at fifty cents a pound, then if it should appear before the debt was extinguished that we could produce or procure cotton at ten cents a pound more advantageously to us than wool at fifty cents, could our creditors in that event justly claim the right to payment in wool exclusively, and would it indicate moral turpitude on our part not, at their bidding, to drop out the cotton and make use only of wool, and by so doing not only pay in the more valuable commodity, but contribute directly to the enhancement of the value of that commodity ?

That must be *very* high moral perception that sees only equity in such a claim. It is *so* high that it is clear above rational action, and becomes so entirely unselfish as to partake of the angelic to a degree not likely to be followed by grovelling mortals.

A. J. W.

MARIETTA, O., August 12, 1876.

[First : The evidence is not clear that the change in the relation of silver to gold is "all" due to a fall in silver. But that it is mainly due to it is provable by reference to the only standard we have of the value of either gold or silver—the prices of commodities. If the whole world were to demonetize silver, it would, doubtless, for a while raise the value of gold, but the annual production of gold is still very large, and the tendency after the first pinch would be downward.]

Second : The case suggested by our correspondent is what is called on the Stock Exchange a "put" in cotton or wool, or, in other words, a bet that on a certain day cotton or wool will be selling above or below a certain rate. It would, therefore, not indicate any greater "moral turpitude" than appears in every gambling transaction to pay in cotton or wool at the rate agreed upon. That our correspondent does not perceive the difference between a speculative transaction of this kind and a promise to pay in coin is, however, probably a result of the confusing moral effect of the prolonged use of irredeemable paper-money. These remarks apply also to the subjoined letter of Mr. Luke Palmer, jr. ; and for the benefit of both gentlemen we have composed the following short catechism, containing a simple lesson both in casuistry and currency :

Q. If you sold a piece of land, and took the note of the purchaser at two years, would you be content with his promise to pay in "something or other" ?

A. No, because in that case I should not know whether I would receive for my land as much as it was worth to me when I sold it.

Q. Suppose the purchaser offered to pay you in cotton or wool, at a certain rate per pound, would you accept it ?

A. No, not unless I was disposed to speculate in cotton or wool. If I were in the habit of doing so, I might take a "put" in either of those commodities, in the expectation of a rise in them before the day of payment ; but being a plain, industrious man, with a family to support, and

entirely unused to speculation, I should refuse payment in these commodities at any price he would be likely to fix.

Q. Your objection to them, then, would be the uncertainty as to their value—that is, their tendency to rise and fall in price from day to day ?

A. Certainly.

Q. In what, then, would you insist on having him promise to pay you ?

A. In coin.

Q. In what coin ?

A. Gold or silver.

Q. Why not iron or copper ?

A. Because they, too, like cotton and wool, fluctuate greatly in value in relation to other commodities, and would leave me in the same state of uncertainty.

Q. Your notion is, then, that gold and silver are absolutely steady in value ?

A. Not at all ; but I know they are and have been for two hundred years steadier in value, both in relation to each other and to other commodities, than any other substances of equal durability, divisibility, and transportability.

Q. So you care nothing about "coin" unless it has greater steadiness in value than any other commodity ?

A. Nothing. Why should I ? Rapidly and heavily fluctuating coin would give me no more certainty than wool or cotton or corn.

Q. If, then, you part with your land for a promise of gold or silver coin, what do you call it ?

A. A sale.

Q. And if you part with it for a promise of cotton or wool or iron, what do you call it ?

A. A speculation. In the one case, I have all the certainty possible in human transactions as to what I shall receive back ; in the other case, I have none.

Q. How do you account for "A. J. W.'s" and Mr. Luke Palmer's not seeing this distinction which is so clear to you ?

A. I ascribe it to their long familiarity with irredeemable paper. From seeing the value of this money go up and down, and seeing men speculate in the very standard of value as in cotton or wool, they have come to look on *all* transactions as speculations, and see no more wrong in making a profit out of the depreciation of the medium of exchange than out of the rise or fall of merchandise or stocks. They evidently take and give "puts and calls" in legal-tenders, or in gold measured in legal-tenders—operations which I look on as immoral and dangerous.

Q. Suppose, if you had agreed to take payment for your land in gold or silver coin, on account of their long-established steadiness, and in the interval before the note became due the silver suddenly fell enormously in value, so that \$1,000 of it would only bring \$750, and your debtor were to seize this opportunity of paying you in silver, what would be your opinion of his conduct ?

A. I should consider it fraudulent, because he would be giving me less in reality than he promised to give me and than he knew I expected when I made the sale, though I might not have any legal remedy. A promise, as is well known, consists in the state of mind of the promisor and promisee, and not simply in the form of words they use.

Q. If your debtor had given you notice that he would not pay you in silver when silver was high, what would you think of his withdrawing the notice and making preparations to pay you in it after it had fallen ?

A. I should consider it fraudulent, as before.

Q. Is not this trick of evading obligations by making the same name cover two different things a well known one, familiar to moralists and police-officers ?

A. It is.

Q. When a government does a thing of this kind, is it any less heinous than when individuals do it, as these two gentlemen seem to suppose ?

A. On the contrary, it is more so. An individual is often the victim of his necessities, and may have special defects of character, while a government is supposed to embody the highest morality and capacity of the whole people.

Q. What rule in the interpretation of treaties and statutes has been based on this doctrine ?

A. The rule that a government is always to be supposed to intend what is just and honest, whatever ambiguity there may be in its language.

Q. You have read Mr. Palmer's assertion that the national credit would not be damaged by paying the public debts in a depreciated currency, because "its ability to fulfil its contracts" would remain the same as ever. What is the error in that assertion ?

A. The error lies in the assumption made by all the inflationists, that ability to pay and paying are the same thing, and that therefore, as they say, as long as your notes are "based" on property you may issue as many as you please, though you have no intention of ever redeeming them. He has overlooked the fact that ability to pay may support a private man's credit, because the courts will make him pay; but that the foundations of public credit are wholly moral, because a government need not pay unless it pleases. The richer a cheating nation is, therefore, the worse its credit becomes. Robbers could not get credit though they had a cave full of gold; and the more means a repudiating state boasts the more the honest portion of mankind is disgusted.

Q. What remedy would you advise for the loose notions of public morality displayed in these two letters, and the widespread disposition to sneer at strict fidelity to obligations as merely a celestial view of duty, and the readiness even of clergymen and professors to condone political fraud and jobbery?

A. All good influences, of course, are needed to produce any change for the better; but I should think among the first would be the disappearance from circulation of all unfulfilled Government promises, and the introduction into schools, and colleges, and especially divinity schools, of more practice in the application of the lessons of morality to the ordinary problems of commercial and political life.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The great influence which the *Nation* has in moulding the political opinions of its readers renders its friends solicitous that it should be upon the right side of every question.

For this reason, and because of the opposition of the *Nation* to silver money, I have presumed to present a brief argument and ask a few questions on this subject, in the hope that a letter from a Western man may not be uninteresting.

There is a class of men who desire that the silver dollar should be made a legal tender in payment of all debts both public and private, who are not in any sense inflationists, repudiators of the national debt, or friends of the greenback.

They recognize fully the distinction between a promise to pay on Government paper and actual payment in coin. And in the abstract question whether it is better for governments to adopt a single or a double standard of values, they would vote for the former, and probably for the gold standard.

But, under the peculiar circumstances in which our Government is placed, they ask that the trade dollar may be remonetized, and the reasons they assign are worthy of consideration.

Up to 1873, the silver dollar and the fractional pieces coined prior to 1854 were a legal tender in payment of all sums, while the silver coins below the dollar coined in 1854 and since were a legal tender for sums not exceeding five dollars.

In 1873, silver was deprived of its legal-tender qualities except in sums not exceeding five dollars.

It thus appears that when our national debt was created silver was a legal tender for all sums, and it was optional with the nation to pay its debt in gold or silver, the agreement being to pay in coin. In 1873, when silver was deprived of its legal-tender qualities in payment of large sums, the trade dollar was more valuable than the dollar in gold. This fact prevented any strong opposition on the part of the people to the gold standard, for at that time they would have chosen to pay our debt in gold. Silver had, however, been decreasing in value for several years, and it was no longer a mere conjecture among speculators and bondholders that silver dollars would soon become less valuable than gold dollars.

Realizing this fact fully, and knowing how much the value of their bonds depended on the value of the legal tender, they were not slow in using all their powerful influence in favor of the exclusive gold standard, and in 1873 their design was successfully accomplished.

Under these circumstances, the question presented to us for solution is, Would it be honest now to pay our debt with silver? I think no one will hesitate to say that previous to the passage of the Legal-tender Act of 1873 it would have been perfectly honest to pay our debt in either gold or silver, and that now we might with equal propriety pay with the cheaper metal were it not for the Legal-tender Act referred to.

Suppose a man should buy a farm on credit, agreeing to pay therefor in one year the sum of \$1,000, or 2,000 bushels of corn, at his own option, would any one blame him for paying in corn worth say forty cents per bushel? Nay, would not men look upon him as foolish beyond all explanation if he paid the \$1,000 when \$800 would have bought the corn?

And would it not be honest in the strictest sense? It was a part of the bargain that the grantor of the farm should run the risk of corn being worth less than fifty cents. So in the case of the purchasers of bonds; they had notice at the time that both gold and silver were legal tenders, and they expected the Government to pay with the cheapest metal.

They did not expect to be paid in greenbacks, although they, too, have been legal tenders since 1862, because they were not legal tender for that purpose, and, besides, were themselves notes which had to be redeemed, the "one dollar" stamped upon the greenback being, as some one has said, as though a milkman should print upon his tickets, "This is a quart of milk."

The only objection, then, to the honesty of paying our debt in silver is that Congress said in 1873, We will pay in gold.

But this promise was no part of the contract with the bondholders; indeed, it lacked one of the essential elements which enter into every contract—viz., there was no consideration for the promise. Instead of a contract, it resembles more strongly a promise to make a gift to the bondholders on each dollar of the national debt of the difference between a gold and silver dollar, and that, too, by Congress, the relation of which to the people may be likened to that of a guardian to his ward. What would be thought of a promise by a guardian to pay from the funds of his ward more money than his contract called for? In the case above supposed of the purchase of a farm on credit, let us suppose, further, that the purchaser dies before making payment: would it not be regarded as a gross breach of his trust, and an outrageous violation of his duty to the heirs, if the administrator should pay the \$1,000 for the farm instead of paying in corn worth only \$800, the agreement being, as we have seen, that he might pay in either?

A promise without consideration to pay in either particular one would be in reckless disregard of the interest of the estate, and would be revocable by the maker at any time before execution.

I suppose it is fair to apply these elementary legal propositions to the question, for our laws, at least in theory, are based on the most complete justice.

Congress, as the guardian of this nation, not only has no right to give away our public money, but ought in justice to us to revoke any promise to do so. In this view of the case, it is no doubt deplorable that the Legal-tender Act of 1873 was passed; but the injury done to the bondholders by revoking that promise given by Congress without consideration and the violation of its trust, is in no degree comparable with the immense injustice done to our taxpaying citizens by allowing it to remain on the statute-books.

The fact that such a course would reduce the value of the greenback should not affect the question, because a reduction under such circumstances does not indicate any diminution in the credit of the nation—i.e., of its ability to fulfil its contracts—but only a decreased value in the commodity in which payment is to be made, similar to the reduction in value of notes given by wealthy men when the greenback was first made a legal tender.

This reduction in value would merely indicate diminution in the magnitude of our debt. Our ability to pay would be increased, and hence our credit would improve.

LUKE PALMER, JR.

BURLINGTON, IOWA, August 10, 1876.

A DISINTERESTED OPINION ON THE GENEVA AWARD.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The able and manly presentation of the *Alabama* case which has appeared from time to time in your columns, and the skill with which you have exposed the sophistries of those who advocate a disposition of the award never contemplated by the Tribunal, entitle you to the thanks of every lover of his country's honor. You have with the utmost fairness freely admitted communications from those representing both sides of the question. It appears to me that no one can have read the arguments with which you have sustained your position without coming to the conclusion that they are on the side of what is just and right. The *Nation* has added to the debt which the community already owes it for its staunch advocacy in this instance also of what must commend itself to the approval of all honorable men.

I can uphold your course in regard to the *Alabama* claims with the greater disinterestedness and freedom because I am one of the war-premium men—that is, I am one of those who during a period of the war were obliged to pay extra rates of insurance, or war premiums, varying from time to time according to the danger, real or supposed, on vessels in which they had an interest, and which were exposed to capture by Confederate

cruisers. It is undoubtedly true that those days were very dark for the American shipowner. The Government whose flag his ships carried, and to which he clung, refusing to exchange it for that of a "neutral," and thereby to receive the advantages which "neutrals" then enjoyed, was unable to protect him, and he found himself compelled to run the risk of losing his property altogether, or to insure it at a premium which he could ill afford to pay. Nor was this the only loss which he had to bear. It is perfectly well known that American ships were then forced to accept much lower rates of freight than neutrals with no war risk to pay were able to obtain, so that while the latter, though inferior frequently to their American competitors, were loading rapidly, the former would lie idle at the wharves, or (fortunate if they could get it) accept a rate as much below that ruling as the war premium existing at the time. In many instances the instructions from the other side to shippers here were to ship only by neutrals, so that the American ship could not at times procure freight on any terms, however low.

It will be seen, then, that our merchant marine was at an enormous disadvantage during that period of the war when rebel cruisers like the *Alabama* and *Shenandoah* roamed unmolested over the high seas. Foreign ships of every class and nation reaped the benefit and enjoyed the carrying-trade. And will it not be conceded also, in view of this showing, that American shipowners not only paid the war premiums on their own property directly, but also, indirectly (looking at their diminished freights), those on shipments made by their vessels? Was not their case a very hard one? For, while the rest of the country on land was in a condition of comparative prosperity, the ship-owning interest was unprofitable and depressed—a state of things (leaving out the influences of tariff legislation) which was to a great extent brought about by dangers to which it was exposed on the ocean.

So much must be allowed; and it cannot be denied that the American shipowners bore these hardships with fortitude and resignation. But, deserving as we are in a general sense, crushed, crippled, and restricted as we have been by tariffs and protection and other adverse legislation, it would be better that every ship which "protection to American industry" has allowed to float had gone to the bottom under the guns of the *Alabama*, than that one dollar of this award, received by our Government as a trust for those whose claims were acknowledged to be just, should be misapplied.

It would be useless and presumptuous for me to recapitulate the arguments in favor of a just distribution of this fund which have already been presented by you in so exhaustive a manner. They would only lose, not gain, at my hands. But is not the question of the utmost importance to every American citizen, to him especially who welcomed the establishment of arbitration as a means of reconciling disputes between nations, and believed it to be an incalculable advance in the civilization of the world? Shall we strike a deadly blow at all this, and sustain our position by the quibbling argument (worthy only of the depraved moral nature of a Ben Butler) that the Court, having awarded a sum in satisfaction of "all claims," meant to designate claims of every kind submitted to the Tribunal, and not those which were finally admitted to be valid? Let us hope that this view may not prevail, but that the distribution of the *Alabama* fund may be in accordance with precedents already established, and, what is more important, in accordance with principles which should guide the conduct of nations as well as individuals.

A PAYER OF WAR PREMIUMS.

NEW YORK, August 11, 1876.

Notes.

'MARIE DE MÉDICIS dans les Pays Bas, 1631-1638,' by Major Paul Henrard, has just been published by Baudry, Paris.—J. Munsell, of Albany, has in press a new edition of Mrs. Grant's 'Memoirs of an American Lady,' with a memoir of the author, Mrs. Anne Grant, by Gen. James Grant Wilson, and biographical and illustrative notes; also, a new edition of Doddridge's 'Notes on the Indian Wars of Western Pennsylvania and Virginia,' with a memoir of the author by his daughter.—A history of the origin and early days of *Notes and Queries*, by Mr. W. J. Thoms, its first editor, is now in course of publication in that paper.—T. Whittaker will publish the American edition of the Christian Evidence Society's new volume, 'The Credentials of Christianity.' The preface is written by the Chairman of the Society, the Earl of Harrowby, K.G. The same publisher will also bring out the two lectures on the 'Morals of Trade,' by Heber Newton, of the Anthon Memorial Church, which created

no little stir when delivered. To each is added an appendix and numerous notes.—Professor Huxley is to be so short a time in this country that only a small part of the public can have any opportunity of hearing him. He is to give only three lectures (at Chickering Hall in this city) on September 18, 20, and 22. We understand that most of the tickets are already sold.

—Lord Byron's "romantic play *Sardanapalus*," as the play-bill has it, was produced last week at Booth's Theatre with great splendor, and an amount of faithfulness to historical detail rarely before seen, even on that stage. The scenery has been taken from Layard's 'Nineveh,' the costumes from sketches made in the British Museum, the weapons, banners, furniture, and other paraphernalia from sources equally good, the whole being provided with a Ninevitic drop curtain and music sufficiently Assyrian to seem so to an audience unprovided, as most theatrical audiences may be supposed to be, with "an ear." The arrangement of the play, as given at Booth's, is in four acts, the first covering pretty much, if not absolutely, the same ground as the first act of the tragedy itself, the second being occupied by a ballet, the third ending with the transformation of the king into a hero, and the fourth embracing the original fourth and fifth acts, the whole ending with a funeral pyre on a Titanic scale, surpassing the pyre in "Julius Caesar" as that did an ordinary tar-barrel or clam-bake. It is hardly necessary to say that this production of the play, if it were the first time the deed had ever been done, might fairly be expected to cause Byron, if not to interfere with the proceedings, at least to turn in his grave, since he took the pains at the time of the first publication of the tragedy to warn the public that neither it, nor the 'Two Foscari,' nor 'Cain' were "composed with the most remote view to the stage," and announced his intention of not letting the managers "get hold on't." If this determination was, as it appears, serious, it was certainly wise, for a play more utterly unfitted to the stage has probably never been written. Byron did not call it a "romantic play" but a tragedy, and he purposely made its construction quite antique, preserving the "unities" as far as possible. The result is a long succession of dialogues rather than a play, and not very interesting dialogues at that; hardly any play of character, except in the scene between *Sardanapalus* and his wife; and a great quantity of stilted speeches which nobody cares to listen to. The play as brought out at Booth's is fairly acted, *Sardanapalus* being taken by Mr. F. C. Bangs, who has a little of the divine flame (though it does not burn brightly on a tallow dip like this part), and *Myrrha* by Mrs. Booth, whose acting was very creditable. It must be confessed that the play drags, and that it is a good deal easier to stand two than four acts. The first act and the ballet by themselves make a very enjoyable performance, and if the last two acts could be consolidated—as they certainly could—we should think the management would find their account in the change. The management, with all its realism, does not appear to be in favor of the new pronunciation of ancient languages, for all the actors insist on calling the king *Sardanapylus* instead of *Sardanapalus*, as they would if they were all recent graduates of Harvard. It would be unfair to look at the representation as that of a play in the strict sense of the word, since it is as a spectacle that it appeals to the public taste, and it is as a spectacle and not a play that we think it might be improved.

—A correspondent writes us as follows: "In your article on silver (issue of August 12) you stated that the silver dollar, when legally demonetized in 1873, was worth \$1.03 in gold. The *Evening Post*, the *Cincinnati Gazette*, and *Commercial*, with many other papers, have made the same statement. It seems to rest upon some report of Dr. Linderman, director of United States Mints. During 1873 fine silver bars were worth in London less than 60d. per ounce, say 59½d., at the beginning of the year, and falling to 58d. at its close. The dollar contained 371½ grains of silver— $24\frac{1}{2} \times 60d. = 46\frac{1}{2}d.$, or a little less than 94 cents in gold. I cannot understand how the quotation \$1.03 in gold came to be given. Can you explain it?" The quotations do not come from Dr. Linderman, but from the market prices current. The mistake which our correspondent makes is that his calculations are founded on the supposition that the London price of silver is for silver 1000 fine; whereas it is for English standard 925 fine. The difference between 1000 fine and 925 fine is as near as possible 8 per cent. He thus makes the dollar 94 cents gold; this with 8 per cent. added is 101.52. Silver dollars (412½ grains, our standard 900 fine) were sold in February, 1873, and ruled at \$1.02 a \$1.03, as can be proved by the books of the specie dealers.

—After an interval of six years appears the surgical volume of Part II. of the 'Medical and Surgical History of the Rebellion,' prepared by Assistant-Surgeon George A. Otis. The two volumes, medical and surgical, of

Part I, were issued from the press in 1870; Part III, (on the lower extremities) is still in reserve; and the entire work will make six volumes of grand dimensions. Than this series no Government publication more creditable to the liberality of our national legislature or to American science has ever appeared. The learning, the industry, and, let us add here, the professional modesty of Surgeon Otis would do honor to the medical corps of any military establishment. The volume before us opens with Chapter VI, and is strictly a continuation of the preceding surgical volume of Part I, which treated of wounds of the head, face, neck, spine, and chest. Here we deal with wounds of the abdomen, pelvis, back (flesh wounds), and upper extremities. Surgeon Otis shows by tabular comparison that, according to the statistics of foreign wars—including the Crimean, Italian, Danish, Bohemian campaign of '66, Franco-German, etc.—one-third of all wounds received in battle are in the upper extremities. As a consequence, the space devoted to this class of wounds (pp. 433-1023) is proportionally large. Of the very numerous subdivisions, we may refer to the chapter on amputation for shot injuries at the shoulder-joint as a valuable test of American surgery. When the expectant treatment could be and was resorted to, the mortality amounted to 25.1 per cent.; under excision, to 36.6 per cent.; under amputation, to 31.1 per cent.—or about 31 per cent. for the whole. In the foreign wars referred to, the percentage of mortality was one-half, but, as Surgeon Otis points out, so high a figure would not have resulted except for the French contingent. The ill-success of the French surgeons, he suggests, may have been due to bad hospitals, faulty treatment of the operations, or inferior vital resistance on the part of French soldiers. We can appropriately quote here the remark with which the author closes his final chapter: "It is a grateful reflection that while this volume has treated largely of the various modes of operative interference often indispensable in the surgery of war, the general teaching deduced from the multitude of facts tends, not only in regard to the hand, but in relation to every region, to justify and encourage an enlightened conservatism." To give some idea of the "multitude of facts" relied on for such a conclusion, let us cite a list of partial field-returns of shot-wounds during the last year of the war. They amounted to 106,846 cases. Several thousand more added to these gave a basis for computing that wounds of the abdomen (pelvis excluded) averaged one in twenty-nine wounds of all kinds, or 3.3 per cent. Foreign statistics give 3.8 per cent.—a substantial agreement. From this cause die ten or eleven per cent. of all who perish in action; nearly half of all cases reported as shot-wounds of the belly prove fatal; and nine-tenths of those reported as penetrating wounds. The illustrations of this volume are as usual profuse and of a high order—wood-cuts, lithographs, chromos, and permanent photographs. One specimen, from the Army Museum, reproduced by the latter process, shows a fracture of the left *os innominatum* by a shell fragment, with the fragment wired in place. To do justice to the familiarity with the literature of his subject which Surgeon Otis displays, without ostentation, one must turn to the volume itself, rich in references to the experience of all nations, and abounding in foot-notes as interesting as the text.

—The National Museum at Rio de Janeiro, which antedates the Empire, but which has had hitherto a rather languishing existence, was reorganized by an Imperial decree of February 9. It now has for its object the study of natural history, particularly that of Brazil, and instruction in the natural and physical sciences, especially in their application to agriculture, industry, and the arts. Its three divisions are anthropology, botany, and physical sciences (mineralogy, geology, and general palæontology); and for the present, while awaiting a future independent development, archæology, ethnography, and numismatics will be under the care of the Museum. Public lecture courses will be held gratuitously from March 1 to November 1. Among the employés of the institution are travelling naturalists. The general director, Dr. Ladislaus Netto, is also director of the second section; of the first section, Dr. Joaquim Pizarro is director; and of the third, our own countryman, Prof. Charles Fred. Hartt. The organ, finally, of the Museum is a quarterly *Archivos do Museu Nacional*, whose motto, "Nunquam aliud natura, aliud sapientia dicit" (Juv. 14, 321), is a good equivalent of the Wordsworthian

"To the solid ground
Of Nature trusts the mind which builds for aye"

adopted by *Nature*. We have received No. 1 of the *Archivos*. It contains, besides the preliminary matter, three papers, viz., one on the shell-heaps (*sambapuis, sambagués, esqueiros, or ostreiras*) of Southern Brazil, by Prof. Carl Wiener, who had been specially commissioned by the Museum to study them; one, by Prof. Hartt, on the curious subject of ceramic "fig-leaves," if we may so designate the triangular bits of pottery used *pueris et uxoribus* by the Indian aborigines of the Amazonian island of Marajó; and one by Dr. Netto on some observations in botanical histology. The first

two papers are accompanied by interesting plates. The typographical accuracy of this number is not all that could be desired. The punctuation is often redundant, and foreign names which are cited in the text and in the foot-notes fare hardly. Harvard University is rendered "Natvan University," and Prof. Wiener allows himself to cite an American work as follows verbatim: "Geology and Physical Geography of Brazil by Ch. Fred. Hartt—Professor of Geology in Cornell University—Boston Fields"; and "The Highlands of the Brazil, by Captain Richard Burton.—F.R.G.S. etc. London Tinsley Brothers—1869."

—To the July number of the *New Quarterly Magazine* Mr. Charles Elliot Browne contributes a paper, under the title of "A Wit of the Last Generation," devoted to Joseph Jekyll, whom we should imagine to be but little more than a name to most modern readers. Yet he lived in the sight of the world for eighty-five years (1752-1837), "the last living link in the chain which connected the society of Johnson and Burke with that of D'Orsay and Disraeli," and held his own with Sheridan in his youth and with Sidney Smith in his age; Cowper thought him witty, and Byron ranked him second only to Curran; his Whig epigrams divided attention with the Tory verses of Frere and Canning, for in those days parody and versified satire were "still real and effective weapons of political warfare," and Jekyll's ready pen and ready tongue were always at the service of his party. In short, he was one of a type gone for ever. The memory of the type lingers rather than the recollection of the man; and indeed, few things are more evanescent than the reputation of a wit when unsupported by anything more solid than talk or *vers d'occasion*; and it is therefore with small wonder that we find only small wit in the most of the many epigrams and anecdotes industriously collected in the twenty-two pages of Mr. Browne's article. The jest rarely rises above a pun, and not seldom sinks below it. An Irish barrister, just arrived in England, had a bad habit of putting out his tongue. "I suppose," said Jekyll, "that he is trying to catch the English accent." He was a lawyer, and his most neatly-turned jests are professional; his, for instance, is the familiar couplet on Garrow's cross-questioning an old woman, and trying to elicit from her that a tender had been made for some premises in dispute—

"Garrow, forbear! That tough old jade
Can never prove a tender maid."

The ceiling once fell on a dinner-party at Lansdowne House, which Jekyll had escaped, owing to a prior engagement to meet the judges. "I had been asked," he said, "to 'Ruat Coelum,' but dined instead with 'Fiat Justitia.'" Although he was only known at the common-law bar, Lord Eldon in 1816 appointed him a Master in Chancery, a piece of court jobbery which caused great scandal. It was done at the repeated request of the Prince Regent, who would take no denial. Forcing his way into the Chancellor's room when he lay sick in bed, he urged Jekyll's claims against Lord Eldon's objections. "His Highness at last suddenly threw himself back in his chair," says the Chancellor in his account of the interview, "exclaiming, 'How I do pity Lady Eldon!' 'Good God!' I said, 'what is the matter?' 'Oh! nothing,' answered the Prince, 'except that she will never see you again, for here I remain until you make Jekyll a Master in Chancery.' I was obliged at length to give in; I could not help it. However, Jekyll got on capitally. He continued in office until age and indisposition obliged him to retire on the usual pension. I met him in the street the day after his retirement, when, according to his usual manner, he addressed me with a joke: 'Yesterday, Lord Chancellor, I was your master; to-day I am my own master.'"

—Extracts from the MS. diary of an American loyalist, of which we made mention in No. 578, continue to appear in *Notes and Queries*. They are quite worth printing in England and reading in America, for they show what we are well-nigh forgetting now—the strength of the old Tory party. The diarist's bias is obvious. He speaks, for instance, of "that old scoundrel Franklin," and we regret sincerely to see that he has a poor opinion of the Philadelphians. He even goes so far as to say that "in one point, not contented with being not agreeable, they are almost disagreeable: the almost universal topic of conversation among them is the superiority of Philadelphia over every other spot of the globe." But his ill-will is hardly to be wondered at, for he wrote after having been forced to leave the country, and after having had his Maryland estates confiscated. In 1799 were published, as we learn from Sabine's "American Loyalists," fifteen discourses preached by him in America between the years 1763 and 1775 on the causes and consequences of the American Revolution. These, in spite of his poor opinion of Washington (as quoted in the *Nation*, No. 578), he dedicated to our first President, of whom he also relates the following anecdote:

"I happened to be going across the Potomac . . . exactly at the

time that General Washington was crossing it on his way to the northward, whither he was going to take command of the Continental Army. There had been a great meeting of people and great doings in Alexandria on the occasion, and everybody seemed to be on fire, either with rum, or patriotism, or both. . . . The General (then only Colonel) Washington beckoned us to stop, as we did, just, as he said, to shake us by the hand. His behavior to me was now, as it had always been, polite and respectful; and I shall for ever remember what passed in the few disturbed moments of conversation we then had. From his going on his present errand, I foresaw and apprised him of much that has since happened; in particular that there would certainly be a civil war, and that the Americans would soon declare for independence. With more earnestness than was usual with his great reserve, he scouted my apprehensions, adding (and I believe with perfect sincerity) that if ever I heard of his joining any such measures I had his leave to set him down for everything wicked. . . . So little do men know of themselves, and so dangerous is it to make one false step."

STUBBS'S CONSTITUTIONAL HISTORY OF ENGLAND.*

PROFESSOR STUBBS possesses, like most men who think clearly, the power of expressing his thoughts with clearness and simplicity. The one defect of his style is that it scarcely makes sufficiently obvious to ordinary readers the salient points of the subject with which the writer deals. It would be grossly unfair to assert that Mr. Stubbs was himself in any way overpowered by the weight of the immense amount of facts which he has accumulated. He is in every sense master of his topic, and excels most writers in the art with which he establishes his conclusions by the mere effect of the mass of evidence which he produces, without wasting time in controversial argument. But his very love for facts, combined with an almost morbid aversion to rhetorical exaggeration, deprives his writing of the emphasis which arrests the attention of students. Even an intelligent reader may occasionally lose his path, so to speak, amidst the crowd of facts compressed into the Professor's pages, and persons who are not used to draw conclusions for themselves may fail to seize the important inferences which the writer suggests rather than enunciates, and suggests, moreover, with an absence of dogmatism which the ignorant may possibly mistake for a want of certainty. It may, therefore, be of service to our readers if, instead of dwelling on the general characteristics of our author, we direct their attention to some single topic among the hundreds of which Professor Stubbs treats. Whoever has once appreciated the infinite amount not only of information but of instructive suggestion to be found within the limits of five or six pages, will be able to form some conception of the merits of the most important contribution to the knowledge of English history which has appeared for years. A reviewer feels grievously tempted to sketch Mr. Stubbs's views of that most difficult of all topics—the Royal Prerogative. But the subject as a whole is too large to be dealt with even cursorily within the limits of a newspaper review, and all that we can attempt is to point out for special notice that part of the present volume which treats of the Royal revenue and expenditure. Any student might rationally expect that this portion of the book would be of special interest, for Mr. Stubbs has always shown himself a master of the financial side of constitutional history. In his 'Select Charters' and in the first volume of his present work, he exhibited in a masterly manner the connection between the judicial and the financial system which was fully developed by Henry the Second—a connection of which traces are still to be seen in the position of the coroner and the nominal connection between the Court of Exchequer and the Chancellor of the Exchequer. In this volume he examines with infinite care the financial resources of the Crown during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, and explains the meaning of the principle constantly urged by mediæval reformers that "the king should live on his own." Neither the facts of the case nor the views entertained of the king's duty are very easy to understand. It is quite clear that the expenditure of the Crown was felt to be oppressive, but it is by no means so easy to ascertain what were the exact resources of the king, and how far the popular idea that he could and ought to live on his own was justified by the facts of the case. As to the monarch's resources, "we may conclude that in time of peace he had a revenue of about £65,000; that for a national object or for a popular king grants would be readily obtained to the amount of £80,000; and that under great pressure, and by bringing every source of income at once into account, as much as £120,000 might be raised in addition to the ordinary revenue." The "ordinary revenue," however, is what was meant by the "king's own," on which, according to popular theory, the king should live. If it is difficult to give an account of the revenue, the task is still harder of ascertaining the amount of the royal expenditure. "The Wardrobe Account of 28 Edward I. assigns the several items of ex-

penditure thus: Alms, £1,166 14s. 6d.; necessities, horses bought, messengers, wages, and shoes, £3,249 16s. 2d.; victualling stores and provisions for the royal castles, £18,638 1s. 8d.; the wages of military officers, artillerymen, infantry, and mariners, £9,796 9s. 2½d.; the proper expenses for the wardrobe, including the purchases made for the Queen and the Chancery, £15,575 18s. 5½d.; the difference between the sum of the wardrobe account and the entire outlay of the King of £10,946 5s. 4d. is put down to the expense of the household, and probably accounted for in another roll."

Now, these and similar accounts are in several ways of extreme importance. They, in the first place, make it hard to understand the "constant irritation caused by the expenses of the household." The existence of the sentiment that the royal extravagance was the source of popular suffering is certain, but it is also clear that mere personal expenditure was not what would, in the judgment of modern times, be considered a large item in the royal budget. Part of the widespread feeling was due to popular delusions. An ordinary Englishman, living under the Plantagenets, believed the king's treasure to be unlimited, just as a modern Turk fancies that the sultan possesses untold millions of hard coin. An Englishman of the thirteenth or fourteenth century felt also, as does a modern Turk, that he constantly suffered from the exactions of the Government, and as naturally, after the manner of all uncivilized persons, believed that the expenditure of the court was the sole cause of the exactions under which he suffered. Taxation, also, if not exorbitantly heavy, was raised in modes which must have been terribly oppressive. The millions raised by a modern income-tax caused not one-hundredth part of the suffering of the thousands raised by means of purveyance. Payment in kind is of all modes of payment the least remunerative to the recipient and the most oppressive to the man who pays it. A further consideration is that good government, even of a rough kind, is dear. A half-civilized community do not appreciate good government, and detest paying its price. But when everything is taken into consideration which may more or less account for the general outcry against the extravagance of mediæval monarchs, the general feeling cannot, we suspect, be understood by any one who does not realize that this question of royal expenditure touches the radical flaw in the whole feudal system. The king was not a public official, but a great proprietor. His prerogative was, to some extent, made up of the privileges of a great landowner. His public and his private expenditure was hopelessly mixed up together, or rather the distinction which all civilized nations draw between the public revenue and the private property of the ruler did not exist. If Edward II. incurred debts, they were paid, if at all, by the nation. The strange mixture of private and public accounts in the passage which we have cited is characteristic of the whole system. The king, it is true, spent the greater part of the revenue on what we should call public purposes; but these public purposes, as, for example, the administration of justice, were private interests of the Crown. The judges, like other ministers, were, in fact, royal servants. Payments to the judges were, or at any rate seemed to be, payments to men engaged in looking after the rights of the Crown. A good deal of the phraseology of English public life bears traces of the system under which the Government was really a body mainly existing for the benefit of the Crown. The confusion of ideas generated in the barbarism of the Middle Ages produced one-half of the constitutional disputes which culminated in the great Rebellion. The confusion lingered on into quite modern times. The judges were, in the reign of George III., paid out of the civil list, and the condition of things which called for Burke's schemes of economic reform was caused in part by the partial survival of the system which confounded the private expenditure of the king with the public expenses of Government. Even now an English monarch hardly occupies the position of a public official. The time will doubtless come when a king will be seen to be as much the servant of the nation as the President, but this period has in England not yet arrived. The ghost, so to speak, of the feudal system still lingers on in a society based on principles quite foreign to feudalism. While the influence of that system survives, no one will understand the exact position of an English king who has not studied, under some guide as competent as Professor Stubbs, the theories which prevailed when the English Constitution assumed the form which it retains even at the present day.

BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

Authors.—Titles.	Publishers.—Price.
Abbott (Rev. E. A.), Latin Prose.....	(John Allyn) \$1 00
Brockett (Dr. L. P.), Silk Industry in America.....	(Silk Association of America)
De Vere (A.), St. Thomas of Canterbury. Poem.....	(Catholic Publication Society) 2 50
Fischer (Dr. G.), Elements of Latin Grammar.....	(J. W. Schermerhorn & Co.)
Griffis (W. E.), The Mikado's Empire.....	(Harper & Bros.)
Levenson (R. M.), First Steps in Political Economy.....	(Authors' Pub. Co.)
Land (J. P. A.), Principles of Hebrew Grammar.....	(Trübner & Co.)

* 'The Constitutional History of England. By Wm. Stubbs, M.A.' Vol. II. London and New York: Macmillan & Co.

"The admirable Leisure Hour Series."—NATION.

Catalogues sent on application.

HENRY HOLT & CO., 25 Bond Street, N. Y.

A Long-Needed Book.

"Double-Entry Book-keeping," as now practised in all leading houses, simply, briefly, and practically explained. The subject divested of all complication and difficulty. Cloth, \$1; boards, 75 cts. Sent post-paid. Catalogue free. D. B. WAGGENER & CO., 420 Walnut St., Philadelphia, Publishers of 'Waggener's Improved Trial-Balance Book.'

FOR any Book Desired or Information respecting Prices and Editions, address LOCKWOOD, BROOKS & CO., Boston, Mass., who will promptly reply. Books carefully forwarded, post-paid, on receipt of advertised price. Send for catalogue of our own publications.

A FULL STOCK OF

Books in Foreign Languages.

Subscriptions for Periodicals.

SCHOENHOF & MOELLER, Importers and Publishers, 40 Winter Street, Boston.

Catalogues sent on application.

BOOKS AT LONDON PRICES.

Now Ready: Catalogue No. 9 of Rare, Valuable, and Curious Books, free on application.

JOHN EVANS, Importer, 121 Fulton St., Brooklyn, N. Y.

F. W. CHRISTERN,

FOREIGN BOOKSELLER AND IMPORTER,
77 UNIVERSITY PLACE, NEW YORK.

Large assortments of the publications of Charpentier, Didot, Didot, Hachette, Lévy Frères, etc., on hand; also complete lists of Tauchnitz's Collection of British Authors, and Teubner's Greek and Roman Classics. All European periodicals received weekly in parcels.

WE ARE CONTINUALLY

changing our immense stock of Old, Rare, and Curious Books.

If you visit the Centennial, and want to spend a pleasant hour, call in at Fifth and Walnut Streets, and look over them. And then you can say you have seen the largest collection of old books in America.

LEARY'S OLD-BOOK STORE,
Fifth and Walnut Streets, Philadelphia

JUST READY.

Autumnal Catarrh
(HAY FEVER).

By MORRILL WYMAN, M.D. Revised and enlarged edition. With illustrative maps and tables. In one volume 8vo, cloth, \$2.

The first edition of 'Autumnal Catarrh' was published in 1872, and was quickly exhausted. Dr. Wyman has obtained much valuable information since then, and now offers the results of his latest investigations and enquiries, including many additional cases. The volume contains an enumeration of villages, hotels, and other places in non-catarrhal regions, with table of their heights, and four maps, colored so as to show those portions of the United States liable to the disease and those which are exempt.

* For sale by all Booksellers and at the principal White Mountain Hotels. Sent, post-paid, to any address on receipt of price by the publishers.

HURD & HOUGHTON, NEW YORK;
THE RIVERSIDE PRESS, CAMBRIDGE.

School Bulletin Publications.

6,000 REGENTS' QUESTIONS, 1866-1876. Complete, \$1.

THE SAME, separately, Arith., Geog., Gram., Spelling; each, 25 cts.

THE ARITHMETIC QUESTIONS, in separate card-board slips, \$1.

COMMON-SCHOOL LAW. The Standard Text-book, 2d edition, 50 cts.

STUDIES IN ARTICULATION. By James H. Hoose, Ph.D., 50 cts.

THE SCHOOL BULLETIN, Monthly, 16 to 24 pages. Per year, \$1.

C. W. BARDEEN, Publisher,
SYRACUSE, N. Y.

Prof. Huxley's Lectures.

Prof. T. H. HUXLEY, of London, will give three illustrated lectures on "The Direct Evidence of Evolution" at Chickering Hall, New York, Sept. 18, 20, and 22, at 8 o'clock P.M. Tickets securing seats for the course, price \$5, are to be had at the bookstore of D. Appleton & Co., 549 and 551 Broadway, or by application and remittance through the mail. This is the only course of lectures that Prof. Huxley will deliver in this country, as he sails for Liverpool Sept. 23.

To Teachers and Students.

G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS, 182 Fifth Avenue, New York, call attention to their new Series of ATLASES for Classes and for Reference, comprising Fourteen Works, priced at from 75 cents to \$14; also, to Hart's German Classics for Students (3 vols. ready), used in Yale, Princeton, Bowdoin, and many other colleges; the Elementary Science Series (23 vols. ready), and the Advanced Series (8 vols. ready); Haydn's Dictionary of Dates, fourteenth edition; Putnam's World's Progress, twentieth thousand; Putnam's new School Histories (5 vols. ready), Hill's True Order of Studies, and other Standard Publications. A complete Catalogue, containing specimen pages of the Science Series and of the German Classics, mailed on receipt of stamp.

G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS' EDUCATIONAL Catalogue contains works on Art, Astronomy, Botany, Elocution, Geography (General, Physical, and Historical), Geology, Geometry, German, History (English, American, and General), Literature, Mechanics, Mathematics, Mental Science, Naval Science, Pedagogy, Political Economy, etc.

Special attention is invited to their 'German Classics for American Students,' and to their very complete series of Atlases. Catalogue forwarded upon application.

182 Fifth Avenue (near Twenty-third Street), New York

Ginn Brothers' (Boston)

NEW BOOKS FOR JULY AND AUGUST.

Essentials of English Grammar. By W. D. Whitney, of Yale College. First Lessons in Greek. By J. W. White, of Harvard College. Revised Editions of Leighton's Latin Lessons and Allen & Greenough's Method.

Recently Issued:

Fitz's Globe and Manual. Fifth Music Reader. Gilmore's Art of Expression. Arnold's English Literature. Hudson's Text-book of Prose and Poetry. Pamphlets of Burke, Webster, Bacon, Wordsworth, Shakespeare, etc. "Our World" Geographies. Allen & Greenough's Latin Works. Godwin's Greek. Mason's Music, etc.

JOHN WILEY & SONS,

15 Astor Place, NEW YORK,

PUBLISHER

PROF. S. E. WARREN'S

Series of Preparatory, College, and Polytechnic School Text-Books.

FREE-HAND GEOMETRICAL DRAWING AND Lettering.

ELEMENTARY PLANE PROBLEMS.

DRAFTING INSTRUMENTS, MATERIALS, AND Operations, etc.

ELEMENTARY PROJECTION OR PLAN AND Elevation Drawing, with Shadows and Isometric Drawing.

ELEMENTARY PERSPECTIVE OF FORMS AND Shadows.

DESCRIPTIVE GEOMETRY. Complete Solutions, Large Figures, Examples for Practice.

SHADES AND SHADOWS. Concisely comprehensive. LINEAR PERSPECTIVE. General and Practical Problems.

MACHINE CONSTRUCTION AND DRAWING.

GEARING.

STEREOTOMY: Problems in Stone-Cutting.

For full Descriptive Catalogue and Circulars, Terms, etc., address as above. Also for sale by all leading Booksellers.

* J. WILEY & SONS' new complete Descriptive Catalogue of Scientific Text-Books and Practical Works sent gratis on application.

The Authors' Publishing Co.,

27 BOND STREET, NEW YORK,

Publish this day:

COMMON SENSE; OR, FIRST

Steps in Political Economy. By Dr. M. R. LEVERSON. 12mo, cloth, \$1.25.

For business men, financiers, operatives, and students; with an appendix for teachers adapting it perfectly for schools. Every man can learn from it. Every child above ten years can understand it. Every teacher can teach it thoroughly.

Educational and Scientific
TEXT-BOOKS

PUBLISHED BY

D. VAN NOSTRAND,

23 Murray and 27 Warren Street, New York.

WEISBACH'S MECHANICS OF

Engineering. Theoretical Mechanics. Translated from the fourth augmented and improved German edition, by Eckley B. Cox, With 906 wood-cut illustrations. 8vo, 1100 pages, cloth, \$10.

PLATTNER'S BLOW-PIPE ANALYSIS.

A Complete Guide to Qualitative and Quantitative Examinations with the Blow-Pipe. Revised and enlarged by Prof. Richter, Freiburg. Translated from the last German edition by Prof. H. B. Cornwall, assisted by J. H. Caswell. Illustrated with 87 wood-cuts and one lithographic plate. 8vo, 550 pages, cloth, price reduced to \$5.

MCCULLOCH'S ELEMENTARY

Treatise on Heat. On the Mechanical Theory of Heat and its Application to Air and Steam Engines. 8vo, cloth, \$3.50.

QUALITATIVE CHEMICAL ANALYSIS.

A Guide to the Practical Study of Chemistry and in the work of Analysis. By S. H. Douglas and A. E. Prescott, of the University of Michigan. New edition in press, and ready 1st of October. 8vo.

BLOW-PIPE ANALYSIS. A System

of Instruction in its Practical Use, being a Graduated Course of Analysis for the use of Students and all those engaged in the Examination of Metallic Combinations. Second edition, with an Appendix and a copious Index. By Prof. G. W. Plympton, of the Polytechnic Institute, Brooklyn. Illustrated. 1 vol. 12mo, cloth, \$2.

OUTLINES OF PROXIMATE ORGANIC ANALYSIS.

For the Identification, Separation, and Quantitative Determination of the more commonly occurring Organic Compounds. By Albert B. Prescott, of the University of Michigan. 12mo, cloth, \$1.75.

NAQUET'S LEGAL CHEMISTRY.

A Guide to the Detection of Poisons, Falsification of Writings, Adulteration of Alimentary and Pharmaceutical Substances, Analysis of Ashes, and Examination of Hair, Coins, Arms, and Stains, as applied to Chemical Jurisprudence, for the Use of Chemists, Physicians, Lawyers, Pharmacists, and Experts. Translated from the French by J. P. Battershall, Ph.D. 12mo, cloth, \$2.

A COMPENDIOUS MANUAL OF

Qualitative Chemical Analysis. By Charles W. Eliot and Frank H. Storer. New edition, revised, with the co-operation of the author, by W. R. Nichols, Professor of Chemistry in the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Illustrated. 12mo, cloth, \$1.50.

RAMMELSBURG'S GUIDE TO A

Course of Quantitative Chemical Analysis, especially of Minerals and Furnace Products. Illustrated by example. Translated by J. Towler, M.D. 8vo, cl., \$2.25.

AN INTRODUCTION TO CHEMICAL PHYSICS.

Designed for the use of Academies, Colleges, and High Schools. Illustrated with numerous engravings, and containing copious experiments, with directions for preparing them. By Professor Thomas Russell Pynchon, M.A. New edition, revised and enlarged. 12mo, cloth, \$3.

STONEY ON STRAINS. The Theory

of Strains in Girders and similar Structures. 8vo, cloth, \$12.50.

NAVIGATION AND NAUTICAL

Astronomy. Prepared for the use of the United States Naval Academy by Prof. J. H. C. Coffin. 12mo, cloth, illustrated, \$3.50.

MACCORD'S SLIDE-VALVE. A

Practical Treatise of the Action of the Eccentric upon the Slide-Valve. By Prof. W. C. MacCord of the Stevens Institute. 4to, cloth, illustrated, \$3.

IRON TRUSS-BRIDGES FOR

Railroads. The Method of Calculating the Strains in Trusses, with comparisons of the most prominent ones. By Col. Wm. E. Merrill. Second edition. 4to, cl., \$5.

